VOL. XXXVII., No. 46.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, SEPTEMBER 16, 1893.

Contents.

Cases Reported this Week.

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE CAUSE lists of the present long vacation have not presented any remarkable features with the exception that although on each day of the sitting of the court the list had a substantial appearance, it collapsed on every occasion by reason of the majority of the cases standing over. Mr. Justice WRIGHT has now finished his half of the work, and will next week be succeeded by Mr. Justice KENNEDY.

A FRESH notice as to vacation business is about to be issued under the auspices of Mr. Justice KENNEDY, who takes up the vacation work on Monday, the 18th inst. The vacation sittings will be held in Queen's Bench Court No. II. at 10.30 on Wednesdays commencing on Wednesday, the 20th inst. Previously to that the learned judge will, on the same day at 10.15 in Queen's Bench Court No. III., hear any urgent summonses which may be adjourned to him. On Tuesdays and Thursdays in every week the judge will dispose in chambers of business of the Queen's Bench Division.

WE ARE GLAD to see the statement that Sir HORACE DAVEY has accepted the vacant Lord Justiceship. As we have pointed out, the Court of Appeal greatly required strengthening on the equity side. In Sir HORACE DAVEY, if the statement is correct, the court will have the assistance of a great lawyer and, we anticipate, of a strong judge.

WE COMMENT ELSEWHERE on the correspondence which has taken place with regard to the Land Transfer Bill. Notices to oppose the second reading, which was in the order paper again for Thursday night, have been given by Mr. KIMBER, Mr. PIERPOINT, Mr. MACLURE, and Mr. SETON-KERR. It is thus insured that the Bill shall not be slipped through without discussion, but in the present state of public business it does not appear that any adequate discussion of its principles can take place, and it is to be hoped that the matter may be deferred till the Autumn Session. Such a discussion is eminently to be desired, and it should not be difficult to make it clear that the Bill is intended to bolster up the Land Transfer Office, and to force upon landowners a system which all experience shews they will not voluntarily have anything to do with.

IN ACCORDANCE with the reply recently addressed by the Lord Chancellor to the representations of the Bar Committee as to the inconvenience caused by the absence on circuit of the judge to whom winding-up business is assigned, arrangements have been made for Mr. Justice WRIGHT to act as an additional judge in winding up. Either Mr. Justice VAUGHAN WILLIAMS or the additional judge will always be in town, and the winding-up business will be carried on continuously through the sittings when necessary. This, of course, will obviate some of the inconvenience which has been felt, but the change will not be so beneficial as if the winding-up judge had been taken from circuit work altogether, and made a fixture in town. It is important to have a judge at hand before whom the business can be carried on without interruption, but it is also important to have particular cases managed continuously by the same judge.

IN THE CASE of *The British South Africa Co.* v. *The Companhia de Mocambique*, which we report elsewhere, the House of Lords have reversed the decision of the Court of Appeal (FRY and LOPES, L.JJ., Lord ESHER, M.R., *diss.*) and have restored the judgment of the Divisional Court (LAWRANCE and WRIGHT, JJ.). The question involved is one of considerable interest. Before the Judicature Acts the division of actions into local and transitory, and the requirement of a local venue in actions of the former kind made it impossible, so the courts held, to bring an action in this country to recover damages for trespass to land abroad. Such an action must be tried in the county where the land was situated, and this rule prevented redress being given where the cause of action arose in a foreign country. Transitory actions also sometimes required a local venue, as where a local matter was stated in the pleadings, but, to save the jurisdiction of the English courts, the fiction was introduced of alleging the foreign place to be in an English county. This fiction, however, was not extended to actions such as *trespass quare clausum fregit*, which were in their nature local. Why the fiction was not thus extended is a matter of some doubt. Was it merely that, in an action in its nature local, the technical requirement of local venue was strictly insisted upon, or was it that the courts felt this technical fetter upon their jurisdiction to coincide with a proper limitation of that jurisdiction? The majority in the Court of Appeal took the former view. The jurisdiction to try matters arising abroad was inherent in the courts, and was only kept dormant by the existence of the technical fetter. The jurisdiction was naturally limited, by the impossibility of executing a judgment for the recovery of the land itself, to the recovery of damages for the trespass, but they followed Lord MANSFIELD (*Mostyn* v. *Fabrigas*, Cowp. 161) in

holding that to this extent the jurisdiction existed. Lord Mansfield was prepared to discard the requirement of local venue where it interfered with the jurisdiction as thus defined, but subsequent judges did not follow him (*Doulson* v. *Matthew*, 4 T. R. 503). Fry and Lopes, L.JJ., however, thought that all difficulty on this head was removed by the Rules of the Supreme Court, 1883, ord. 36, r. 1, which abolishes the requirement of a local venue. Lord Esher, and now the House of Lords, have taken the opposite view, that the technical fetter coincided with a substantial restriction on the jurisdiction of English courts. Either on grounds of convenience, or on grounds of international comity, the courts of one country may not entertain suits dealing directly with rights in respect of land situated in another. This view is, perhaps, not very greatly supported by the authorities, either English or American, but it has one strong argument in its favour. To give the rule under the Judicature Acts the effect contended for would be to allow those Acts, not merely to regulate procedure, but to alter the rights of parties, and this, it has been held, is not permissible (*Britain* v. *Rossiter*, 11 Q. B. D., at p. 129).

Some novel suggestions were made at the Chicago Congress on Jurisprudence by Mr. Hurd in his paper on "Legislative Restraints on the Transmission of Property by Descent or Will," to which we referred recently (*ante*, p. 737). In this he contrasted the policy of English and of American law as to the devolution of property on death. The policy of the English law, he said, is to build up great estates, and hence the rule of primogeniture in descent, assisted by the practice of entailment. The policy of the United States, on the other hand, as expressed by Chancellor Kent, "is to allow a free circulation of property by the abolition of perpetuities, entailments, the claims of primogeniture and all inequalities of descent, thus preserving a proper equilibrium and dissipating the mounds of property as fast as they accumulate." This policy is supposed to be embodied in the laws of descent, which "are quite uniform throughout the United States, and devolve the property of intestates upon the next of kin without regard to the size of the estate or the number of the next of kin." But with equal division upon an intestacy is generally associated the unqualified power of disposition by will, and, in practice, the tendency towards the accumulation of enormous fortunes, with the consequent social discontent, seems to be greater in America than in England. To counteract this tendency, and assist in securing a greater diffusion of property, Mr. Hurd looks to a change in the law of devolution on death, so as to limit the amount any one person may take by descent or will. What this limitation should be he does not attempt to state, but by way of illustration he shews that in the case of large estates, after allowing a definite amount to the next of kin in the first degree, the surplus might go successively in lessening amounts to the next of kin in the later degrees, until the estate is exhausted. If the next of kin are all satisfied before the estate is distributed, the balance might go to the State, as the whole goes now on a failure of next of kin; but he does not advocate an inheritance tax by which a proportion of the estate would go into the public purse in the first instance. "I do not," he says, "believe in a successive or inheritance tax or any other device by which wealth is to be turned over to the State as a prevention of the evils resulting from excessive cumulation in few hands. It would take that much property out of the reach of competition and individual enterprize and build up an official class quite as objectionable as any other class. The true policy is to keep the wealth in the hands of the people, and in the hands of as many of the people as possible." In the rest of the paper Mr. Hurd discusses the possibility of effecting such a change as he suggests by legislation, and he points out that in Illinois there is already a restraint on the power of testamentary disposition. "A husband or wife cannot by will deprive the other of a certain share which the Statute of Descent gives to the survivor. Thus, when the descendant leaves no child or descendants of a child, the surviving husband or wife will take one-half the real and personal estate by descent, any will to the contrary notwithstanding."

THE LAND TRANSFER BILL.

We hope that the correspondence which we print elsewhere, and other correspondence which has been going on recently in the daily press, will have the effect of awakening members of the House of Commons to the attempt which is being made to force the Land Registry Office on the public. The only possible justification of such an attempt would be that registration of title, as effected under the Land Transfer Act, 1875, has in practice proved to be both popular and successful, and that for its complete success universal registration is essential. It is needless to say that the first of these conditions has not been fulfilled. Judged by results, the system of the Land Registry Office has been a miserable failure. Had it answered a public want, or had it had any conspicuous merits of its own, it could not have failed in the course of eighteen years to attract a large share of business. But the reverse is the case. The number of titles which have been placed on the register is insignificant, and persons who accept such a title find themselves exposed to so much inconvenience that not infrequently they would be glad to take it off again. One reason of this is that the two parties to a transaction, instead of settling the business through their own professional advisers, find themselves confronted with the delay and difficulties interposed by the regulations and practice of a public office. Left to themselves, they can secure that the matter shall be carried through with despatch, and any points that arise can be arranged by mutual consent. But we fear that persons who regard the passing of the Land Transfer Bill with favour or indifference have not realized the constant vexation and delay that must ensue when every transaction has to be effected through officials. These points are well illustrated in the letter by a "City Solicitor."

Neither is there any good reason why registration should be universal. If a title is on the register, well and good. All persons dealing with it have the benefits or the disadvantages arising from this circumstance, whichever may prevail. But this has nothing to do with any other title, and the fact that a system has commended itself to one landowner is not a ground for forcing it on his neighbour. But there is no need to insist on this. If the Land Transfer Act of 1875 had proved successful it might or might not be expedient, by making it compulsory, to make the system universal. The fact that the Act has in practice proved unsuccessful ought to be quite sufficient to debar it from being made compulsory.

Mr. Brickdale refers to the report of the select committee of 1879 as though it were ancient history, and he regards it as quite sufficient that the principle of compulsion has now been affirmed by the House of Lords. That the Land Registry Office by the help of the present and the late Lord Chancellor have got the Bill through the House of Lords is unfortunately true, but we hope this will not be regarded as in any way dispensing with the necessity for a full discussion of its principles in the House of Commons. It is true that the committee of 1879 reported upon the system of registration of title after the Act of 1875 had been for only a short time in operation, but this does not alter the fact that they did, as Mr. Lake points out, report against the principle of compulsion. How the circumstance that some fourteen years have since elapsed detracts from the force of this, if the Land Transfer Act still remains as it was then, practically inoperative, we do not understand. We refer of course to the actual number of its transactions as compared with the whole body of land transactions throughout the country. If in the interval there had been a great change in public opinion in favour of the system of the Land Registry Office, then it might be needless to recur to the report of 1879; but, as we have already remarked, nothing of the kind has taken place. So far as the actual prevalence of registration of title is concerned, we are practically where we were in 1879, and it is for those who impugn the report of that year to shew that a compulsory registration which was improper then is proper now. *Primâ facie* the inference seems to be clearly the other way. In the interval, as Mr. Saunders points out, the practice of conveyancing has been improved by the passing of statutes which have been at once voluntarily adopted, and there is less reason than ever for interfering compulsorily with the system of conveyancing which commends itself to the vast majority of landowners.

One strong objection to the present system of registration is, as Mr. LAKE in his first letter stated, the difficulty it interposes in the way of dealing with land by way of temporary mortgage, and perhaps the most surprising part of Mr. BRICKDALE'S letter is that in which he endeavours to meet the objection. Hitherto it has been supposed that the proper way of creating an equitable charge is to deposit the land certificate under section 81 of the Land Transfer Act, 1875, and lodge a caution under section 53. Originally the fee for the caution was £1, but, under the rules of January, 1889, it was raised to the full amount that would be payable on registration of the mortgage. Attention having been called to this by Mr. LAKE (36 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 680), the rule of August, 1892, was issued, under which the fee was fixed again at £1, with the restriction that the caution should be effectual for one year only, and that the rule should not apply on a renewal of it. Practically, therefore, the rule is useless, and Mr. LAKE naturally notices this in his letter. Mr. BRICKDALE appears to admit that section 53 as applied to equitable charges is a failure, but he has a remedy in section 57. "By section 57," he says, "the Act provides a system of 'inhibiting orders' suitable for the protection of such charges, which can be made summarily by the registrar on the owners' and bankers' application. No *ad valorem* fee is payable on these under any circumstances." But the language of the section hardly seems to indicate that it was intended to introduce a summary procedure "suitable for the protection" of equitable charges. The section is too long to quote, but it provides for the making of such inquiries (if any), the giving of such notices, and the hearing of such persons as the court or registrar thinks expedient, and, after all this, for the issue of an order inhibiting generally, or for a defined time, all dealings with the land. An inhibiting order thus obtained is doubtless very effectual, but whether it can be obtained without expense and delay is not so clear. Moreover, as Mr. LAKE points out, the Land Registry Office, in the regulations issued by them, take the same view of the matter. "An equitable charge," they say, "can be made by the deposit of a land certificate, but as its production is not required on transfers, the mere deposit is very little security, unless protected by a caution or restriction." "An inhibition is very rarely resorted to, as it is in the nature of an injunction, and would only be issued in very special circumstances."

Of course, it is for the interest of the Government to assist the Land Registry Office in making registration of title compulsory. As a voluntary system it has failed, and the Office has not been able to pay its expenses; but, as a compulsory system —and, if once the Bill is passed, there will be every inducement to extend it as rapidly as possible to the whole country—the result may be expected to be very different. "A very low scale of fees (in lieu of existing costs of conveyance)," said the Chancellor of the Exchequer the other day, in answer to Mr. GREENE, "will, in our opinion, suffice for covering office expenses, so great is the number of transactions in land." Doubtless this is the correct view to take of the question of fees now, but if the Land Registry Office obtains its monopoly, it will be an easy matter to fix the fees so as to produce a substantial increase of Government revenue. When this result, which Mr. LAKE not without reason foretells, has been brought about, landowners will find that, instead of paying the costs of professional advisers selected by themselves and able and willing to serve their interests, they will have to pay fees to a public office, the first duty of which will be to keep up and maintain a handsome surplus, and which will regard their wants and convenience as only of secondary importance.

DEATH CERTIFICATION.

THE report of the Select Committee on Death Certification, which has just been published, is one of the most interesting and valuable Parliamentary papers of the present session. Probably the clearest method of dealing with this subject will be to take the recommendations of the committee in order, and to consider first the evils against which they are directed, and then the intrinsic worth of the remedies which they seek to apply. The first proposal is that in no case should a death be registered without production of a certificate of the cause of death, signed by a registered medical practitioner, or by a coroner after inquest. Under the existing law and practice a considerable, though happily decreasing, proportion of deaths are registered without certification. No medical man has attended during the last illness; a medical certificate is, therefore, not forthcoming, and the registrar fills up the details, as best he may, on information obtained from the surviving friends, with a right, in the case of sudden, violent, or suspicious deaths, to report the matter to the coroner, who, after an inquest, may order registration.

It is impossible to doubt that this system is radically vicious. The registrar is neither a medical man nor a lawyer; he is entitled, and obliged, to take information from persons who are often utterly incompetent to form a correct opinion as to the cause of death, and are sometimes interested in deceiving him; it is no part of his duty to investigate the facts of the case; he is by no means a good judge of the kind of cases which ought to be referred to the coroner; without such a reference he has no authority to delay registration in order that inquiries may be made; and the practice of coroners in regard to the holding of inquests is not sufficiently uniform to constitute even a reasonably certain guarantee that deaths occasioned by crime or criminal neglect shall not escape the notice of the authorities.

A priori, therefore, we should expect to find that the class of uncertified deaths contributed largely to the volume of undetected national crime, and the select committee supply us with statistical proof that this inference is a correct one. It appears that in London, Dublin, and Glasgow—three cities of sufficient importance to justify an induction—the percentage of uncertified deaths is at its minimum at that period of life when men and women are self-supporting, and when, consequently, their lives are most valuable as breadwinners, namely, between twenty and forty years of age, and that it increases on each side of that period precisely as first or second childhood renders the deceased as a class a burden on their friends. Thus, in Dublin, during the years 1890-2, among deaths of persons between twenty and forty years of age, the percentage of uncertified deaths was 3·2, which we may take as the normal figure; between forty and sixty it had increased by over one-half, and was 5 per cent.; between sixty and eighty it had become 6·9 per cent; while above eighty it was 12·5 per cent., and had thus more than trebled. On the other side of the normal point, of the deaths of persons between five and twenty years old, the percentage of uncertified deaths was 4·8, or nearly half as much again as the normal figure; between the ages of one and five it was 10·8 per cent., or more than treble; between one month and one year it was 20·6, while in the case of infants under one month the ratio was 41·2, or nearly twelve times as great as it was between twenty and forty. These figures are sufficiently eloquent without comment.

The select committee propose to meet the evil by rendering the production of a certificate of the cause of death a condition precedent to registration in all cases. As a statement of the end to be attained this recommendation is, of course, unexceptional. But everything depends on the efficiency of the means adopted for its attainment. The views of the committee on this point are embodied in their second, third, fourth, and fifth recommendations, and are in substance as follows:—If a deceased person was attended during his last illness by a medical practitioner the latter is to certify on a prescribed form, the use of which will be obligatory, the cause of death, as to which he must satisfy himself by a personal inspection of the body; if, however, on the ground of distance, or for some other sufficient reason, he is unable to make this inspection himself, he must obtain and attach to his certificate of the cause of death a certificate signed by two persons, neighbours of the deceased, verifying the fact of death. In cases where a certificate from a medical practitioner in attendance is not forthcoming, the cause, and presumably also the fact, of death are to be ascertained by a public medical certifier—who will be the British analogue of the French *médecin vérificateur*—to be appointed in each sanitary district. All certificates of death will be sent to the registrar instead of being handed, as they now are, to the representatives of the deceased.

On some points of detail these recommendations may be open

to criticism. We are not quite clear that where personal inspection of a corpse cannot be made by the medical man in attendance, the fact of death ought not to be ascertained and certified by the public medical verifier; and in any event the certifying neighbours ought to be made subject, if they certify falsely, to the penalties attaching upon a false attestation to a certificate of marriage. But that the proposals of the select committee will remedy the abuses and defects of the existing law, we have no serious doubt. They will prevent certificates being granted of the deaths of persons who are still alive. They will check the laxity with which too many medical men regard the duty of certifying, and the particulars which they may give, alter, and withhold; and if, as the select committee suggest, care is taken to avoid the choice of registrars who do not understand the meaning of such terms as "rabies," and the election of coroners who permit such verdicts as "A man died from stone in the kidney, which stone he swallowed when lying on a gravel path in a state of drunkenness," or "child, three months old, found dead, but no evidence whether born alive," to be recorded, there is every reason to believe that they will furnish us with a really effective system of death certification.

The committee also recommend the discontinuance of the practice of burial in pits or common graves, the registration of all still births of seven months development—a matter which has recently been brought before the British Medical Association, and in which nearly every civilized country in the world is in advance of us—and the prohibition of burials without an order from the registrar stating the time and place of interment. We cordially trust that this admirable and exhaustive report will at the earliest convenient season receive the attention of the Legislature.

LEGISLATION IN PROGRESS.

MERCHANT SHIPPING.—The following memorandum is prefixed to the Merchant Shipping Bill introduced by Mr. MUNDELLA, which has been read a first time:—"It is proposed by this Bill to repeal and consolidate the present Merchant Shipping Acts. The Consolidation Act of 1854 has now been in force for nearly forty years, and has been amended by some twenty-four subsequent Merchant Shipping Acts, besides other enactments. The number and complexity of the enactments on the subject of merchant shipping have made the law difficult to administer, difficult to observe, and difficult to amend, and the need for consolidation and simplification has become urgent. The Bill, in accordance with the policy adopted by the joint committee of this session on Consolidation Bills, reproduces existing enactments with such alterations only as are required for uniformity of expression and adaptation to existing law and practice, and does not embody any substantial amendment of the law. It is not, however, intended by consolidation to stereotype the existing law, but, on the contrary, to facilitate the making of such amendments as may appear to be required. But any such amendments could be more appropriately embodied in a separate and subsequent measure. Where the Bill departs from the existing Acts in any manner which is not merely verbal, the change is mentioned in the notes to the Bill annexed to this memorandum. The Bill deals with all the subjects contained in the 1854 Merchant Shipping Act, and also consolidates in Part III. the Passenger Acts, which are closely allied to the Merchant Shipping Acts. It will repeal and supersede, for the most part wholly, more than forty Acts. Some difficulty has been experienced in dealing with various provisions which are scheduled to the existing Acts, but which could be altered either by Order in Council or by rules made by a Government department. The sailing rules scheduled to the 1862 Act are a typical instance of this. The rules in themselves are extremely important in practice, and might be expected to appear on the statute book; on the other hand, they were repealed by the Statute Law Revision Act of this year, and if they were scheduled to the new Act, the result would be that, as alterations were made from time to time, a considerable amount of matter which is not law would appear on the statute book as law, and there would be nothing, as far as the statutes are concerned, to shew that any alterations had been made. This would be extremely misleading, and therefore the Bill, following the Statute Law Revision Act, omits these sailing rules and other provisions of a like nature. It will be desirable to postpone the operation of the Bill to allow time for Orders in Council or rules to be made embodying any provisions of the existing Acts relating to these matters which are still in force. The Bill itself consists of 774 clauses and 18 schedules.

BILLS ADVANCED.—The Public Authorities Protection Bill has been read a second time in the House of Commons, and the Trustees (Consolidation) Bill and the Law of Commons Amendment Bill have been read a third time.

BILLS WITHDRAWN.—The House of Commons Orders relating to the following Bills have been discharged and the Bills withdrawn:—Evidence in Criminal Cases Bill, Supreme Court of Judicature Bill, Bills of Sale Bill, and the Copyhold (Consolidation) Bill.

BILLS PASSED INTO LAW.—On the 12th inst. the Royal Assent was given to the Consolidated Fund (No. 4), Irish Education Act, 1892, Amendment (No. 2), Public Works Loans (No. 2), Industrial and Provident Societies, Contagious Diseases (Animals) (Swine Fever), Elementary Education (Blind and Deaf Children), Sheriff Courts Consignations (Scotland), Public Health (London) Act, 1891, Amendment, and Naval Defence Amendment Bills, and to several local and provisional order Bills.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

House of Lords.

THE BRITISH SOUTH AFRICA CO. *v.* THE COMPANHIA DE MOCAMBIQUE AND OTHERS—8th September.

JURISDICTION—TRESPASS TO LAND ABROAD—CLAIM FOR DAMAGES.

Appeal from an order of the Court of Appeal (Fry and Lopes, L.JJ., Esher, M.R., *diss.*) varying an order of a divisional court (Lawrance and Wright, JJ.) in favour of the appellant on questions of law raised by the pleadings. The nature of the pleadings is stated in the report of the case before the Court of Appeal (40 W. R. 650). For the purpose of the present decision it is sufficient to say that the principal question involved was whether the Supreme Court of Judicature had jurisdiction to try an action to recover damages for a trespass to lands situate in a foreign country. The Divisional Court held that it had not, the Court of Appeal that it had. The decision of the majority of the Court of Appeal went upon the ground that the English courts had an inherent jurisdiction to try actions in which a remedy was sought *in personam* only, although the injury complained was in respect of land situate abroad, but that the technical requirement of a local venue in actions of trespass *quare clausum fregit* prevented its exercise. The removal of this requirement by R. S. C., 1883, ord. 36, r. 1, which provides that "there shall be no local venue for the trial of any action, except where otherwise provided by statute," obviated, so it was held, this difficulty, and set free the jurisdiction.

THE HOUSE OF LORDS (Lord HERSCHELL, C., Lords HALSBURY, MACNAGHTEN, and MORRIS) now reversed the judgment of the Court of Appeal, and restored the judgment of the Divisional Court.

Lord HERSCHELL, C., said that the nature of the controversy between the parties rendered it necessary to consider the origin of the distinction between local and transitory actions, and the development of the law which determined the venue or place of trial of issues of fact. It was necessary originally to state truly the venue—that is, the place in which it arose—of every fact in issue; and, if the places were different, each issue would be tried by a jury summoned from the place in which the facts in dispute were stated to have arisen. After the Statute 17 Charles 2, c. 8, which provided that "after verdict judgment should not be stayed or reversed, for that there was no right venue, so as the cause were tried by a jury of the proper county or place where the action was laid," the practice arose, which ultimately became regular and uniform, of trying all the issues by a jury of the venue laid in the action, even though some of the facts were laid elsewhere. When juries ceased to be drawn from the particular town, parish, or hamlet where the fact took place—that is, from amongst those who were supposed to be cognizant of the circumstances—and came to be drawn from the body of the county generally, and to be bound to determine the issues judicially after hearing witnesses, the law began to discriminate between cases in which the truth of the venue was material and those in which it was not so. This gave rise to the distinction between transitory and local actions—that is, between those in which the facts relied on as the foundation of the plaintiff's case have no necessary connection with a particular locality and those in which there is such a connection. In the latter class of actions the plaintiff was bound to lay the venue truly; in the former he might lay it in any county he pleased. It was, however, still necessary to lay every local fact with its true venue on peril of a variance if it should be brought in issue. Where a local matter occurred out of the realm, a difficulty arose, inasmuch as it was supposed that the issue could not be tried, as no jury could be summoned from the place, and it was by the general rule essential that a jury should be summoned from the venue laid to the fact in issue. It was, however, early decided that, notwithstanding the general rule, such matters might be tried by a jury from the venue in the action, and thus the difficulty was removed and the form was introduced of adding after the statement of the foreign place the words, "To wit at Westminster in the County of Middlesex," or whatever else might happen to be the venue in the action. The point arose in 30 & 31 Eliz., in an action of *assumpsit* on a policy of insurance, and it was resolved that the issue should be tried where the action was brought. It was, his lordship thought, important to observe that the distinction between local and transitory actions depended on the nature of the matters involved, and not on the place at which the trial had to take place. It was not called a local action because the venue was local, or a transitory action because the venue might be laid in any county, but the venue was local or transitory according as the action was local or transitory. It would be seen that

this distinction was material when the Judicature rule upon which so much turned came to be examined. He could not but lay great stress upon the fact that whilst lawyers made an exception from the ordinary rule in the case of a local matter occurring outside the realm for which there was no proper place of trial in this country, and invented a fiction which enabled the courts to exercise jurisdiction, they did not make an exception where the cause of action was a local matter arising abroad, and did not extend the fiction to such cases. The rule that in local actions the venue must be local did not, where the cause of action arose in this country, touch the jurisdiction of the courts, but only determined the particular manner in which the jurisdiction should be exercised; but where the matter complained of was local and arose outside the realm, the refusal to adjudicate upon it was in fact a refusal to exercise jurisdiction, and he could not think that the courts would have failed to find a remedy if they had regarded the matter as one within their jurisdiction, and which it was proper for them to adjudicate upon. The earliest authority of importance was *Skinner* v. *East India Co.* (6 St. Tr. 710) where to a question referred to them by the House of Lords the judges answered that, for dispossession of the petitioner's house and island, he was not relievable in any ordinary court of law. Notwithstanding the opinion thus expressed, Lord Mansfield entertained, and in the cases of Captain Gambier and Admiral Palliser acted on, the view that, where damages only were sought in respect of a trespass committed abroad, an action might be maintained in this country, although it was one which would here be a local action. But this view had not been followed. An opposite decision was given in *Doulson* v. *Matthews* (4 T. R. 503). This latter case had ever since been regarded as law, and his lordship did not think it had been considered as founded merely on the technical difficulty that in this country a local venue was requisite in a local action. So in *Mayor of London* v. *Cox* (L. R. 2 E. & I. App. 261) it was clear that Willes, J., regarded an action of trespass to land situate abroad as outside the local limit of jurisdiction of the Queen's Bench. The distinction between matters which are transitory or personal and those which are local in their nature, and the refusal to exercise jurisdiction as regards the latter where they occur outside territorial limits, was not confined to the jurisprudence of this country. Story, in his work on the "Conflict of Laws," after stating that by the Roman law a suit might in many cases be brought, either where property was situate or where the party sued had his domicil, proceeds to say that "even in countries acknowledging the Roman law it has become a very general principle that suits *in rem* should be brought where the property is situate; and this principle is applied with almost universal approbation in regard to immovable property. The same rule is applied to mixed actions, and to all suits which touch the realty." The doctrine laid down by foreign jurists, which was said by Story to coincide in many respects with that of our common law, obviously had relation to the question of jurisdiction, and not to any technical rules determining in what part of a country a cause was to be tried. His lordship was not satisfied that either Lord Mansfield or Story would have regarded an action of trespass to land as a suit for personal damages only if the title to the land were in issue; and in order to determine whether there was a right to damages it was necessary for the court to adjudicate upon the conflicting claims of the parties to real estate. The question what jurisdiction could be exercised by the courts of any country according to its municipal law could not, he thought, be conclusively determined by a reference to principles of international law. No nation could execute its judgments, whether against persons or movables or real property, in the country of another. On the other hand, if the courts of a country were to claim as against a person resident there jurisdiction to adjudicate upon the title to land in a foreign country, and to enforce its adjudication *in personam*, it was by no means certain that any rule of international law would be violated. But in considering what jurisdiction our courts possessed, and had claimed to exercise in relation to matters arising out of the country, the principles which had found general acceptance amongst civilized nations as defining the limits of jurisdiction were of great weight. It was argued that if an action of trespass could not be maintained in this country where the land was situate abroad, a wrongdoer by coming to this country might leave the person wronged without any remedy. It might be a sufficient answer to this argument to say that this was a state of things which had undoubtedly existed for centuries without any evidence of serious mischief or any intervention of the Legislature, for even if the Judicature Rules had the effect contended for, he did not think it could be denied that this was a result neither foreseen nor intended. But there appeared to him to be solid reasons why the courts of this country should, in common with those of most other nations, have refused to adjudicate upon claims of title to foreign land in proceedings founded on an alleged invasion of the proprietary rights attached to it, and to award damages founded on that adjudication. The inconveniences which might arise from such a course were obvious, and it was by no means clear to his mind that if the courts were to exercise jurisdiction in such cases the ends of justice would in the long run, and looking at the matter broadly, be promoted. It was quite true that in the exercise of the undoubted jurisdiction of the courts it might become necessary incidentally to investigate and determine the title to foreign lands, but it did not seem to him to follow that because such a question might incidentally arise and fall to be adjudicated upon, the courts possessed, or that it was expedient that they should exercise, jurisdiction to try an action founded on a disputed claim of title to foreign lands. The decisions of the courts of equity did not, continued his lordship, afford any substantial support to the view that the ground upon which the courts of common law abstained from exercising jurisdiction in relation to trespasses to real property abroad was only the technical difficulty of venue. The terms of rule 1 of order 36, which were relied on by the plaintiffs, were as follows:—"There shall be no local venue for the trial of any action except where otherwise provided by statute." The language used appeared to him important. The rule did not purport to touch the distinction between local and transitory actions, between matters which had no necessary local connection and those which were local in their nature. It dealt only with the place of trial, and enabled actions, whatever their nature, to be tried in any county. But it was, in his opinion, a mere rule of procedure, and applied only to those cases in which the courts at that time exercised jurisdiction. It had been more than once held that the rules under the Judicature Acts were rules of procedure only, and were not intended to affect, and did not affect, the rights of parties (see *per* Lord Cairns in *Kendall* v. *Hamilton*, 28 W. R., at p. 99, 4 App. Cas., at p. 516; *per* Lord Esher, M.R., in *Britain* v. *Rossiter*, 11 Q. B. D., at p. 129). According to the contention of the respondents in this case the rule under consideration had the effect of conferring upon them a right of action in this country which they would not otherwise have possessed. As he had already pointed out, a person whose lands, situate in this country, were trespassed upon, always had a right of action in respect of the trespass. The rules relating to venue did no more than regulate the manner in which the right was to be enforced. But in respect of a trespass to land situate abroad there was no right of action, for an alleged right which the courts would neither recognize nor enforce did not constitute any right at all in point of law. He had come, therefore, to the conclusion that the grounds upon which the courts had hitherto refused to exercise jurisdiction in actions of trespass to lands situate abroad were substantial and not technical, and that the rules of procedure under the Judicature Acts had not conferred a jurisdiction which did not exist before.

Lords HALSBURY, MACNAGHTEN, and MORRIS concurred.—COUNSEL, *Cohen*, Q.C, *Hollams*, and *Lord Robert Cecil*; *Sir H. James*, Q.C., *Bompas*, Q.C., and *Willes Chitty*. SOLICITORS, *Hollams, Son, Coward, & Hawksley*; *Bompas, Bischoff, Dodgson, & Coxe*.

[Reported by C. H. GRAFTON, Barrister-at-Law.]

Before the Vacation Judge.

COLLIE *v.* **BLOXHAM**—13th September.

INJUNCTION—MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS—BALANCE OF CONVENIENCE—URGENCY.

This was a motion by the plaintiff for an injunction to restrain the defendant from setting up or carrying on the profession or business of a surgeon, accoucheur, apothecary, or physician, or any profession or business connected therewith, or from causing or assisting any other person to practice in any department of medicine, surgery, obstetrics, or pharmacy, in Catford, in the county of Kent, or within three miles thereof for a period of ten years, contrary to and in violation of the terms of a written agreement entered into between the plaintiff and defendant dated the 20th of April, 1893. The case came on for hearing before Wright, J., sitting as vacation judge on August 30, when his lordship directed all deponents who had made affidavits to be cross-examined thereupon. The cross-examination had been taken before an examiner, and the motion now came on again. The agreement of the 20th of April was made between the plaintiff, "hereinafter called the principal," of the one part, and the defendant, "hereinafter called the assistant," of the other part, and recited that the "principal" was engaged in medical practice at Catford and desired to secure the services of a competent assistant, and that the defendant had proposed to become his assistant upon the terms thereinafter mentioned. The agreement then went on to provide that the defendant would diligently and faithfully serve the plaintiff as his medical assistant for one month from the date of the agreement and so on from time to time until the contract of service should be determined by either party in manner therein provided; that the assistant would keep accounts and observe the directions of the principal during the continuance of the contract of service; and that the contract of service might be terminated at any time by either party giving the other one month's notice in writing. The plaintiff was to pay the defendant a salary of £200 a year. The agreement lastly provided that for the considerations therein mentioned the assistant should not at any time during the continuance of the contract of service, nor within a period of ten years from the termination thereof, practise or cause or assist any other person to practise in any department of medicine, surgery, obstetrics, or pharmacy in Catford, nor within three miles thereof, except with the written consent of the principal, his executors, administrators, or assigns, and the assistant agreed that should he so practise or cause or assist any other person to practise in the district aforesaid, or in any way violate the obvious intent of this provision, he should forthwith pay to the principal, his executors, administrators, or assigns, the sum of £100 a month for every month during which or part of which he should violate or continue to violate this provision, such sum or sums being payable as ascertained and liquidated damages, and not by way of penalty. The plaintiff's case was that he had caused the defendant, after he became qualified, to take a house and increased his salary in consequence—afterwards he had occasion to become dissatisfied with the defendant, and there were disagreements and unpleasantnesses between them, in consequence of which the plaintiff on the 31st of July terminated the agreement. The defendant notwithstanding, according to the plaintiff's case, continued to practise as a surgeon in breach of the agreement. The plaintiff said that the defendant was without means, and that unless he was at once restrained from violating the agreement he would be irreparably injured. The defendant's case was that there was a "nominal" partnership between himself and the plaintiff up to the 1st of January, 1894; that the agreement of the 20th of April was inconsistent with the real agreement between the parties, and that he signed it without having read and understood or having had proper legal advice; and that the

agreement ought to be set aside. The depositions of the witnesses on the cross-examination were now read. The defendant was thirty-eight years of age, and the plaintiff thirty-three. The defendant said in cross-examination that he was astonished at the plaintiff asking him to sign the agreement, but the plaintiff said it was a matter of form, and notwithstanding his astonishment he signed it. The plaintiff, he said, "chucked" the agreement over to him to read, but he was so astounded that he did not read it. He also said in the cross-examination that the salary he was paid from the 1st of February, 1893, to the date of his obtaining his diploma, the 15th of April, 1893, was given to him as pocket money, and that afterwards he received salary as a "nominal" partner. The plaintiff produced receipts from the defendant, some in his own handwriting, to shew that the defendant had received salary as an assistant, and not as a partner.

WRIGHT, J., granted an injunction until the trial or further order, in accordance with the terms of the notice of motion. In the course of his judgment he said that he was not at all sure which side would succeed at the trial. The defendant, a gentleman aged thirty-eight, had admittedly signed an agreement the effect of which was that the plaintiff was entitled in the circumstances to an injunction. The agreement should be enforced unless it was proved to have been waived or there was some equity against the plaintiff to prevent him from enforcing it. The defendant said, first, that the agreement should be set aside; secondly, that it was never acted on; and, thirdly, that the plaintiff had induced him to incur expenses by taking a house. As to the first part, he could not now consider that. As to the other two, he was not satisfied with the defendant's evidence. He was also not satisfied with the plaintiff's evidence, but the defendant had not made out his case, and he was more dissatisfied with the defendant's evidence than with the plaintiff's. On the question of the balance of convenience and inconvenience his lordship said that the plaintiff had a practice of some duration, which would be seriously interfered with if the defendant were allowed to practise. The defendant had not yet got a practice in the place in question, and he would suffer less than the plaintiff if the injunction were granted.—COUNSEL, *Marten*, Q.C., and *Boome*; *Millar*, Q.C., and *Moore*. SOLICITORS, *Hempson & Elgar*; *Thomas J. Savage*.

[Reported by V. DE S. FOWKE, Barrister-at-Law.]

THE LAND TRANSFER BILL.

THE following is Mr. Brickdale's letter to the editor of the *Times* to which we referred last week:—

Sir,—Mr. Lake's position as a past-president of the Incorporated Law Society and as the head of one of the principal conveyancing firms of Lincoln's-inn entitles his letter in your issue of to-day, deprecating the passing of the present Land Transfer Bill, to careful consideration and full reply. I will take Mr. Lake's points one by one in the order in which he puts them.

1. "Up to the present time no discussion has taken place in Parliament upon this proposal, and no public inquiry has been held since the Select Committee appointed in 1879 . . . reported against making the system of registration of title compulsory."

As to Parliamentary discussion, the present Bill was more than three months before the House of Lords; it was discussed on its second reading; it was considered after more than the usual notice in a full Standing Committee; it passed all its stages in the House of Lords—where the landed interest is usually thought to be fairly strong, not to say jealous—without a single dissent; the Lord Chancellor, Lords Selborne, Halsbury, Esher, Thring, Ashbourne, Macnaghten, and other law lords took part in or were present at the discussions. The views of the Incorporated Law Society (represented in Mr. Lake's letter) were exhaustively and on two separate occasions laid before every member of the House, but failed to find a single champion. Further, the compulsory clause of the Bill is only a milder form of a proposal considered and approved on three several occasions, in 1887, 1888, and 1889, by the whole House, and by a strong Select Committee, who occupied the better part of two whole sessions in their deliberations.

As to the public inquiry of 1878-9, that committee sat when the Land Transfer Act of 1875 had been in operation barely two years, and comparatively little had been done. They merely reported against the adoption of compulsion at that time. They said, "To legislate for the registration of titles without, as a preliminary step, simplifying the titles to be registered, is to begin at the wrong end"; and again, the time may come when, with the help of amendments in the law . . . the unquestionable benefits of registration of title may be more generally appreciated." They recommended ten things. Of these, three related to the interim establishment of deed registries, which was found impracticable, and two to purely theoretical matters; of the remaining five, three have been since carried out, and the other two are contained in the Bill. This is hardly a report which can be properly cited against compulsory registration now.

2. "*Primâ facie* compulsion is wrong, for if a system is advantageous it will commend itself. . . . The existing system has been widely made known . . . but has failed to attract."

Against the abstract position here asserted it may be urged, with at least equal force, that the conditions of land transactions in this country are such that a change of this kind, however beneficial in theory, has in practice no chance of general adoption by a voluntary process within any measurable distance of time. As to the alleged unattractiveness of the present system of registration under the Land Transfer Act, 1875, it has of late years succeeded so well that a greater number of estates and a greater value of land have been registered in the last four years than in all the preceding thirteen years since the passing of the Act. The compulsion proposed by the Bill is tentative. It applies only to districts to be fixed by the Privy Council from time to time, and can be revoked by the same authority. The process is by a method found inexpensive in practice, and, in effect, it only amounts to a guarantee that the system will receive adequate treatment all round for a sufficient time and in a sufficient area to supply a satisfactory test.

3. "Registration increases the dangers of fraud and forgery."

If by this is meant that fraud and forgery are more likely to occur under a registry system than under the existing system it seems enough to remark that, going no further than the first three months of the present year, there are as many as four independent reported cases involving errors, frauds, and forgeries of land titles, every one of which would have been virtually impossible under a registry system.

If, however—as seems likely from what follows—it is meant that fraud and forgery, though possibly of rarer occurrence under a registry system, still, if and when they do occur, will be more disastrous than now, it may first be asked, without much fear as to the answer, which is the better—a system which, as a general, but not by any means invariable, rule, gives security to the existing landholder at the expense of all other parties, and has no compensation whatever for innocent victims of fraud and deceit, or a system in which errors are infinitely rarer, and which, when they do occur, provides compensation to the losing side? The rarity of errors in the registry system is sufficiently proved by the fact that in the English registry, out of several thousand titles now on the books constantly dealt with, no injury of this class has ever occurred, and in Australia, where there are insurance funds and where registration is practically universal, only about £14,000 has been spent in compensations in a like period of time.

4. The exact details of the system of compensation itself require, of course, careful arrangement. Naturally, as a general rule, the register will be supported, and the outsider will be compensated. But to provide for cases where this rule would prove a hardship a discretion is given, vested ultimately in the court, to do whatever is most just in this respect. It may safely be assumed that a *bonâ fide* legal holder of land will be as safe under such a dispensation as he is now. To evict him and force him to accept money compensation in favour of the holder of a mere paper title acquired by the fraud of third parties, without the knowledge and without the default of the true owner, would be an act as wantonly impolitic as it would be flagrantly unjust. Why Mr. Lake assumes in his letter that the registrar would inaugurate, or that the court would uphold, such a proceeding it is difficult to see. It would in any case have been difficult, within the compass of a letter, to follow Mr. Lake into the various points he raises on these provisions; but the task is rendered practically impossible by the fact—which I hope he will forgive me for stating thus generally—that most of his points appear to be founded on an inadequate appreciation of the contents of the Bill, and of the effect of the Land Transfer Act on which it is founded. To suppose that the House of Lords would have passed such a collection of crudities—all against the landowner—as the examples given put forth is really an insult to their lordships' understandings, which I am sure the writer could never have intended seriously to perpetrate.

5. "The difficulties and delays which registration interposes to a temporary borrowing from bankers."

This argument, if a valid one, would, of course, enlist the justly powerful influence of bankers against the Bill. The following observations will shew whether it be valid or not:—

(*a*) The Act of 1875 (section 81) makes special provision for equitable charges by deposit of land certificate.

(*b*) By section 57 it provides a system of "inhibiting orders" suitable for the protection of such charges, which can be made summarily by the registrar on the owners' and bankers' application. No *ad valorem* fee is payable on these under any circumstances.

(*c*) No publicity is involved at any point of the transaction.

(*d*) Bankers' equitable charges are of common occurrence in Australia under the Torrens Acts, and in England in respect of all kinds of registered shares and stock.

In other ways bankers and their customers and the commercial community generally will be great gainers by the firm and general establishment of a register of title. It will enable them to dispense with all investigation of title even on permanent mortgages. By rendering mortgages readily transferable it will make land a much more eligible investment for permanent loans than it is at present.

6. "Publicity seems almost a necessity of the system."

Why? it may be asked. The register has been private for thirty years. No suggestion has been made by anybody—except now by Mr. Lake and the Incorporated Law Society—that it should ever be otherwise. The suggested ground for this prediction is that the land register is usually a public one in other countries. But in all other countries registration of title was preceded, and had been preceded for centuries, by a system of public registration of all deeds—a practice which has never prevailed in this country—save in a jealously limited and guarded manner in two counties only. The point raised was fully dwelt upon by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords, and no one there present pursued it any further.

7 to 9. The next three points—namely, that Sir Robert Torrens did not register his English estates—that Lord Cairns withdrew his compulsory clauses in 1875—and that he doubted in 1879 whether compulsion might not press hardly on small proprietors—may, perhaps, be passed over (as this letter is already rather long) as matters which hardly call for detailed treatment at the present day. Lord Selborne's opinion, expressed on the second reading of the Bill, was entirely in favour of the compulsory proposals, and only echoes the sentiments of the large number of high modern authorities already cited.

10. "Lastly there is great reason to fear that if the system were made compulsory it would be so worked as to become, like the Post Office, a source of revenue for which landowners would have to pay."

The only reason given for this apprehension is that in 1889 the Land Registry fees were substantially raised. When the amounts of those fees are considered, and compared with the usual costs of conveyancing, as we now know them, landowners will not, I think, be so very much alarmed at the samples laid before them. At the same time that the fees were raised many remissions were made of which no mention is made. The fact was that the old scale—or rather one just like it under the 1862 Act—had been proved to be insufficient, and the Legal Departments Commissioners (1874) had recommended that "without making the fees prohibitory, they might be increased to such an amount as would not leave by far the larger portion of the expense to be met by the general public." In small matters the Land Registry fees are still very low indeed. Five shillings now pays the fee for a £50 sale or mortgage, 15s. for £200, and so on. Further, the raising of the fees in 1889 was only a part of a thorough readjustment of the practice of the office, the total effect of which has been greatly to facilitate transactions and to reduce expenses. This is sufficiently shewn by the fact already noted, that in the four years 1889-1892 more work has been done in the way of voluntary registrations than in the thirteen years 1876-1888.

Under the above circumstances I hardly think Mr. Lake has made out a case for further delaying the passing of the present Bill. The main proposal has been before the public for upwards of twenty years. Every Lord Chancellor during that period has either brought in a Bill to establish it, or has helped others to do so. In every country in the world where registration of title has been tried on an adequate scale it has reduced expenses, abolished delays, and increased security. The present Bill is tentative in character, and its method has been proved in numerous instances to be simple and inexpensive. Those who oppose it can only do so by ignoring or contradicting a practically universal experience, and by arguments against State interference in the abstract, of a width and solidity sufficient to jeopardize half the most useful and successful public institutions that have ever been established.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
C. FORTESCUE BRICKDALE,
Assisting Barrister.

Land Registry, Sept. 4.

The following further correspondence on the same subject appeared in the *Times* of the 11th, 12th, and 14th inst.:—

Sir,—Before I deal as briefly as possible with Mr. Brickdale's letter, may I, on behalf of landowners and the public, thank you for opening your columns to this correspondence, and so insuring a clear statement of the advantages and disadvantages of this measure? I am personally in favour of registration of title, but have satisfied myself by careful study of the Act and by practical experience that the system established in 1875 is inherently defective and badly worked, and on these grounds I strongly oppose any attempt to make it compulsory. I and those who think with me urge that the proper course is to perfect the system, and then allow landowners to adopt whichever method of conveyancing is found most convenient. This was the course adopted in Australia, where the system is not compulsory upon private owners, but only upon those who derive title under Crown grants made subsequent to the 1st of October, 1862.

1. The principle of compulsion as applied to conveyancing has never on any occasion been discussed in the House of Commons; nor was it more than referred to in the House of Lords in reference to the present Bill, which, it may be observed, will not, if it become law, affect a single member of that House unless and until he becomes a purchaser.

Mr. Brickdale questions whether the report of the Select Committee of 1879 can be properly cited as against compulsory registration. Its words (p. v.) are, "It would be very difficult to force upon every purchaser or mortgagee in this country a mode of dealing with his property which not one in 20,000 at present adopts of his own accord," and their recommendations are all made in the hope that the system "may be more generally appreciated," not that it should be made compulsory.

2. My objection to compulsion cannot be better stated than in Mr. Brickdale's own words. In his able book on Registration of Title (published in 1886) he, writing as a skilled conveyancer and not as an official of the Land Registry, says (p. 50):—No system really beneficial to landowners would require to be forced upon them, and to apply compulsion to any system not really beneficial would be a wild injustice."

Reforms in conveyancing have hitherto always been voluntary, and have failed or succeeded according as they were or were not found useful. Compare Lord Brougham's Acts for shortening deeds, which wholly failed, with Lord Cairns' Acts of 1881 and 1882, which were immediately adopted.

Mr. Brickdale asserts that the Land Registry is becoming popular. If so, why should it not make its own way? But he does not give any figures.

The compulsion proposed by the Bill may be only partial, but need not be so. An order of the Privy Council may apply it to the whole country, and probably will do so on the ground that by no other means can the system be made to pay.

3 and 4. Mr. Brickdale does not deny my point that the effect of registration under the Act of 1875 is to take away the safety at present insured to a landowner by the possession of his title deeds, and to place the land out of his control and under the control of the registrar, with the result that, if by forgery or otherwise the register is altered in favour of a third person for value and without complicity, the true owner will be dispossessed and be left to his claim (if any) for compensation.

Nor does he deny my statement that no owner who is by the Bill compelled to register with a possessory title will under any circumstances be entitled to compensation from the insurance fund which the Bill proposes to create.

The Bill, therefore, would compel a landowner to incur a danger to which he is not now subject without in any way protecting him against the consequences of so doing.

This is not in accordance with the Australian system, nor is it inherent in registration of title as such. It is a defect in the peculiar system established in 1875, which the Bill seeks to make compulsory.

5. Mr. Brickdale's reply to this is disingenuous and not worthy of his position. He admits the validity of my objection to the system of protection by means of cautions or restrictions (which for this purpose are identical) and evades its force by stating that the proper protection is by means of an inhibiting order, in the Act called an inhibition. The official instructions issued by the Land Registry (p. 13) state:—"An equitable charge can be made by the deposit of a land certificate, but as its production is not required on transfers the mere deposit is very little security unless protected by a caution or restriction," and, lower down, "an inhibition is very rarely resorted to, as it is in the nature of an injunction, and would only be issued in very special circumstances." It is quite true that a landowner will, if his land be registered, find very great difficulty, delay, and expense in borrowing temporarily from his bankers without a formal mortgage, as is the constant custom at present.

Mr. Brickdale states that bankers' charges are frequent in Australia on land certificates and in this country on registered shares and stocks. But he can hardly be ignorant that in both cases the banker's security rests on the fact that neither the land nor the shares and stock can be dealt with without production of the certificate, whereas, under the system of the Act of 1875, "the certificate is not required to be produced or altered on dealings."

6. Whether the register will become public or not is, of course, matter of opinion. It has done so in every other country, and can be made public at any time by the Lord Chancellor—that is, the Government of the day.

7 to 9 need no reply from me. The facts are not disputed.

10. That there is a strong probability that the Land Registry will be worked as a source of revenue is shewn by the undisputed fact that the fees were enormously increased in 1885, and it must be borne in mind that it rests solely with the Government of the day whether the fees shall or shall not be made a source of revenue. Is the experience of the post office, the telegraph system, or the telephones reassuring?

Mr. Brickdale's conclusion would only be justified if the existing Land Registry were perfect, or, at least, good. It is very inferior to that in force in Australia, and it will be a national misfortune if, without any inquiry into its working, landowners are brought under its yoke, from which, contrary to the Act of 1862, there is no way of ever afterwards escaping.

Yours truly,
Lincoln's-inn, September 8. BENJ. G. LAKE

Sir,—Will you permit another ex-President of the Incorporated Law Society, and a country conveyancer of many years' practice, to reply to some of the arguments used by Mr. Brickdale in his answer to Mr. Lake's letter, and to express shortly the view which the country profession take with reference to the Bill now before Parliament?

A considerable part of Mr. Lake's letter and of Mr. Brickdale's reply is devoted to the question of fraud and the compensation provided by the Bill with reference thereto in the way of insurance. On this head I adopt entirely the language of the leading article in the *Times* of June 20, 1890, when reviewing the situation, "that frauds at all due to the present system have for many years been rare, and that in a practical point of view the risks against which a register is supposed to guard do not count for much." The opinion expressed in the above extract was abundantly justified by the evidence taken upon the last Royal Commission, 1879, when some of the most eminent conveyancing counsel and solicitors in the kingdom were examined on that head, and their experience was uniformly that of the late William Barber, Q.C., a distinguished member of the Conveyancing Bar, who said:—"In the course of a very large experience I cannot at this moment recall a single instance where on a purchase and sale transaction the purchaser has been ousted because of a fraud in the execution of a deed."

In my own practice, I only recollect a single instance, and that happened thirty-five years ago.

Registration, then, either of deeds or titles, is not required to protect honest men against rogues, and if not, for what purpose is it required? Mr. Brickdale argues his case with all the zeal of a recent convert; his views were very differently expressed at one time, but his zeal leads him to overstate his case. He cannot omit reference to the recommendations of the committee of 1879, the last solemn inquiry held on the subject, and the report on which was based upon practical and trustworthy evidence, and not upon the dreams of theorists, but he passes them over as but slightly affecting the arguments for the Bill before the House.

The fact is, that those recommendations, so far as they affect the main object of the present Bill, went directly in the teeth of its proposals. For positively the commissioners, after full consideration of that long *vexata quæstio*, the comparative advantages of registration of title as against registration of deeds, decided absolutely in favour of a registration of deeds with local registers, not as Mr. Brickdale puts it, somewhat unfairly, as "an interim establishment of deed registries which was found impracticable," but as a substitute for the more impracticable system of registration of titles.

The Commissioners further reported clearly and absolutely against compulsory registration. How, then, can Mr. Brickdale say, "This is hardly a report that can be properly cited against compulsory registration now"?

Again, any reader of Mr. Brickdale's letter who was not an expert would

draw the conclusion that a system of registration of titles prevailed in nearly every civilized country.

He says, "In every country of the world where registration of title has been tried," &c., and, again, "Those who oppose it can only do so by ignoring or contradicting a practically universal experience."

Is Mr. Brickdale aware that in the United States, in France, Italy, Bavaria, Hesse, Greece, and, so far as I know, in every European country where registration is in force, there are deeds evidencing the title, and the registration is of assurances; and, in France at least, the registration fees amount to 5 per cent. and the legal charges from 1 to 2 per cent.?

So much for the "practically universal experience" which we are told by Mr. Brickdale we shall ignore if we oppose the Bill providing for the registration of title, and in a scarcely veiled manner for the abolition of deeds as evidences of title. On this last point I refer to an insidious section of the Bill which would appear to owe its origin to that ever-recurring fallacy of the theorists on the subject of registration of title, that land can be conveyed like stocks, by issuing on each transfer a new certificate, and so doing away with those deeds the value of which as evidence of identity, title to rights of way, light, boundary walls, and other easements practical conveyancers can best estimate, although, as reported by the Commissioners of 1879, "Englishmen generally have a superstitious reverence for their title deeds."

I must briefly refer to other points.

What we contend is that no sufficient cause has been shewn for the introduction of a compulsory system of registration of title. Mr. Brickdale would overpower us by quoting an array of illustrious and learned lords who have approved of the Bill. We have unbounded respect for the possessors of these great names, and if he could give us one great conveyancing name amongst them, practical lawyers would be more disposed to listen to this argument, but when we remember that only three years ago, in the debates in the Lords, arguments were used by personages of the highest authority, based upon the assumption that the greatest of the practical reforms contained in Lord Cairns' Conveyancing Acts had never come into operation, we may be excused in urging with all the persistency and strength in our power that, until at least the Bill has been referred to a select committee with power to hear evidence—the evidence especially of the practical conveyancer in both branches of the profession—we are justified in continuing our opposition.

In that leading article in the *Times* to which I have referred, the reforms effected by the legislation of recent years are well summed up in the following sentence:—"Matters have been improved by the Vendor and Purchaser Act and the recent Conveyancing Acts, evidence of title abbreviated, deeds shortened, the use of technical phraseology rendered unnecessary, and usual and reasonable covenants implied without being expressed." We are quite ready to admit that there are other practical reforms which will still further improve our conveyancing system, and two of which, as Mr. Brickdale claims, are in the Bill and to which there is no objection. Such reforms would be gladly welcomed by the profession, but we know full well, from such experience as some of us have had of the working of the Registration Acts of 1862 and 1875, that the introduction of a system of compulsory registration of title would be a daily annoyance, interposing an obstacle at every step to the present freedom, expedition, and secrecy with which we can transact our client's affairs, and that without any benefit to the client in the diminution of costs.

Lastly, we have asked, and asked in vain, for any evidence that such a vital change in the law affecting the transfer of land is demanded by public opinion. On the contrary, as the *Times* puts it in the leader from which I have twice quoted, and after referring to the miserable result of the establishment of registries under the Acts of 1862 and 1875:—"There, however, stands the fact that the process, even if cheap, is not popular or ever likely to be so, and this is not to be explained by the theory that solicitors have 'boycotted' the Act. We prefer to speak of it as selling something which few people want."

At all events, let there be a thorough sifting of the working of the present system, its conveniences and cost, and the anticipated benefits to be derived from compulsory registration, by means of evidence to be taken before a select committee, as to which course Mr. Gladstone apparently has no objection. That, and that alone, will satisfy us.

Birmingham, Sept. 9. C. T. Saunders.

Sir,—The long letter from Mr. Lake, which you print in your issue of September 4, ably refers to many of the objections to compulsory registration of titles to land. The subject is of interest to all landowners, but many have a crude notion that a conveyance of land ought to be as simple as a transfer of Consols. Lawyers know how impracticable this must be. I will not discuss this notion, but I think I may ask you to allow me to cite one or two cases within my experience which shew that any registration of title must be productive of delay, and, therefore, serious loss, to owners of building estates, the registration of title to which is often held out as so desirable. Large estates seldom dealt with present no special claim to consideration, but, say the advocates of the compulsory system, why, in an estate intended to be cut up into a thousand plots, should each of the thousand purchasers have to investigate the title to the whole, whereas a duly-registered title with a map of the estate would simplify matters and ease his pocket. Now for my instances.

Several years since some clients of mine, whose business it was to purchase estates and develop them for building, were desirous of purchasing a property suitable for their purpose. I advised them not to do so because the property was on the Land Register. They regarded my objection as a lawyer's prejudice, and, contrary to my advice, agreed to purchase, knowing they would have to look to me for immediate advances on the houses during erection, and for roads and other matters. Then began their sorrows. We prepared and completed our conveyance, and paid our purchase-money of course. This before we could register the conveyance. When, however, our conveyance, copies of which had to be printed before it could be presented, was offered at the Land Transfer Office, we were told that our measurements, which had been accurately taken, did not agree with the Government plan. We proved to demonstration that the latter was incorrect. It shewed, in fact, a greater frontage than the vendor purported to sell. The vendor could not be expected to convey an excess of what his land measured, and yet at the Land Transfer Office it was insisted that the measurement should agree with the Government plan. We were informed that before the deed could be registered we must get the assent of the adjoining owner, and if the measurements were agreed the difficulty might disappear. (Fancy having to get the consent of an adjoining owner, in some cases probably jealous of his rights!) Our adjoining owner turned out personally to be a very pleasant man, but said he must act under advice, and that we must pay the cost we put him to. His surveyor was not a reasonable man, and in the result we had to give up the notion of getting the consent suggested, and my clients came to the determination that the only chance of dealing with their land with facility was to take it off the register, as such questions as had arisen on registering the whole would be still more likely to arise on registering portions. The matter was so serious to my clients that, notwithstanding the non-registration of their conveyance, my firm made them advances from time to time on the faith that some day the matter would be adjusted. Had we not done so the builders might simply have been ruined, as all their operations must have been at a standstill.

I crave leave to state shortly another case which shews what can be done under the present system of registration of assurances as in force in Middlesex, and how impossible it would be to follow a similar course if compulsory registration of title were adopted. The transaction I wish to refer to was as follows:—A land speculator had purchased some small cottages and land adjoining a main road, the line of frontage being irregular and defined by a ditch. He cleared the ground, and then erected some twenty-five handsome shops. His plans were assented to by the local authority, and shewed that the line of frontage was corrected to the mutual advantage of the owner and public. To have perpetuated the irregular line would have been absurd, but in making the correction there was some encroachment on parts of the highway, but at other points a giving up to the public, the result being a great improvement on the old line. The owner anticipated selling the shops as opportunity offered and granting leases, and then eventually, if he did not retain the ground-rents, dealing with them in parcels or as a whole; but, as frequently happens, the property was not quite ripe for sale, and unless he were prepared to let at inadequate rents time must elapse before his profit could be secured. At this juncture he desired to realize his freehold interest as enhanced by the buildings, and therefore to create at once the ground-rents to be offered for sale. He negotiated a bargain with one of my clients to sell to him, at some reduction of the price stipulated for if the transaction could be carried out within about a week. Under the existing system this was possible. A form of lease to be granted to the vendor immediately after the sale was agreed to, printed in such a way that the prints, some on parchment and some on paper, could be used for the engrossments or for drafts and copies. Memorials for registration in Middlesex were also prepared. The form of conveyance was agreed (the rectification of boundaries having been investigated), and the property as existing accepted, though varying in measurement somewhat from the old plots. The conveyance was executed and registered, as also the leases, within the stipulated time at a cost which was not onerous to the vendor, having regard to the circumstances, and that the transaction involved the preparation of some fifty-one deeds and twenty-six memorials. Thus the satisfactory result was secured that the vendor got his money by the date stipulated.

Now, Sir, if compulsory registration had been in force it would have been impossible to have got through the transaction within a week, or to say in fact what requisitions might not have been made and how long it would have taken to satisfy objections. Further, the cost could not have been arranged beforehand. In a word, the dealing which was possible under the present system would have been impossible, and the vendor would have lost his chance of obtaining the money he required, and on the other hand the purchaser's £4,000 or £5,000 would probably have been invested on some Stock Exchange security.

I speak with about fifty years' experience, but for obvious reasons it is preferable that I should not give my name.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
A City Solicitor.

Sir,—"An ounce of fact is worth a pound of theory." Clients of ours, who have purchased over forty building estates in and near London, bought one that had been placed on the Land Registry. They would never again willingly accept a registered title. Leggatt, Rubinstein, & Co.

No. 5, Raymond-buildings, Gray's-inn,
London, W.C., Sept. 12.

There is, says the *Central Law Journal*, a certain judge in Chicago who rather prides himself on his vast and varied knowledge of law. The other day he was compelled to listen to a case that had been appealed from a justice of the peace. The young practitioner who appeared for the appellant was long and tedious. He brought in all the elementary text-books and quoted the fundamental propositions of law. At last the judge thought it was time to make an effort to hurry him up. "Can't we assume," he said blandly, "that the court knows a little law itself?" "That's the very mistake I made in the lower court," answered the young man. "I don't want to let it defeat me twice."

LEGAL NEWS.

OBITUARY.

Mr. Morgan Lloyd, Q.C., died at his residence, the Grange, Brookgreen, W., on the 5th inst., in his seventy-second year. He was born in 1822, and was called to the bar at the Middle Temple in 1847. He was made a Q.C. in 1873 and a bencher in 1875. He was the author of "The Law and Practice of the County Courts" and of "The Supreme Court of Judicature Acts, 1873 and 1875." In 1868 he unsuccessfully contested the Anglesey Boroughs in the Liberal interest, and at the general election of 1874 was returned for Beaumaris, being re-elected without opposition in 1880. Upon the extinction of Beaumaris as a parliamentary borough he contested Merionethshire at the general election of 1885, but was defeated. At the general election of last year he was again unsuccessful in contesting Anglesey in the Dissentient Liberal interest. He was twice married—first, in 1848, to Mary Keith, daughter of the late Admiral the Hon. C. Elphinstone Fleeming, and, secondly, in 1879, to Priscilla, only child of the late Mr. James Lewes, of Cwmhyar, Cardiganshire. Mr. Morgan Lloyd was a magistrate for Merionethshire.

CHANGES IN PARTNERSHIPS.

Dissolution.

Robert Willcock and Christopher Byron, solicitors (Willcock & Byron), 49, Queen-street, Wolverhampton. Sept. 8. Robert Willcock will in future carry on business at 49, Queen-street, Wolverhampton, and Christopher Byron at 22, Lichfield-street, Wolverhampton.

[*Gazette*, Sept. 12.

GENERAL.

The Lord Chancellor and Lady Herschell have left town for Deal Castle, Kent.

Mr. Carrington, curator of the Belvoir manuscripts, has just discovered some very important deeds at Belvoir Castle. One is the grant by King John to one of the ancestors of the Vernon family of the land on which Haddon Hall now stands. The deed is in splendid preservation, and is dated 1199, and is the earliest charter known relating to land in that part of England.

Mr. Justice Wright has, at the request of the Lord Chancellor, consented to act (in conjunction with Mr. Justice Williams) as the additional judge before whom company winding-up business will be heard. It has been arranged that one of the above-named judges shall in future always remain in town while the other is on circuit or otherwise engaged, so that the winding-up business may be carried on continuously and without interruption at all times during the sittings when necessary.

A curious summons, says the *Daily News*, for the adulteration of milk was heard on the 9th inst. at Marylebone. The milk supplied by the defendant, a farmer, had been "sampled" by a sanitary inspector as it came to the station, and had been certified to contain from six to seven per cent. of "added" water. The defendant, however, on learning the result, had another supply analyzed as it came from the cow, and it then yielded from eight to nine per cent. of water. There could be no doubt as to the honesty of the certificate, nor as to the directness of the supply. A respectable analyst himself saw the cows milked, and took away the milk for examination. The water had, in fact, been added by Nature, under the provocation of the exceptionally dry season. The poorness of the food had diminished the solid constituents of the yield. In these circumstances, the magistrate had nothing to do but dismiss the summons. The defendant therefore left the court without a stain upon his own character, or upon that of the cow with the iron tail.

In the House of Commons on the 12th inst. Mr. Greene asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether her Majesty's Government were prepared to advise the application, and to apply public funds, and to what amount, for the purpose of establishing or maintaining, wholly or in part, registries and officers, or to provide for expenses and compensations so as to enable the provisions of the Land Transfer Bill to be carried out; and whether her Majesty's Government had computed the expense or had received or could furnish any estimate either of the cost to the public of establishing and maintaining the proposed system of compulsory registration of title or of the revenue likely to arise from the charges to be payable upon registration. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in answer, said that the Government did not contemplate the necessity of applying public funds for the purpose of the Land Transfer Bill. A very low scale of fees (in lieu of existing costs of conveyance) would, in their opinion, suffice for covering office expenses, so great was the number of transactions in land.

In the House of Commons on the 9th inst. Mr. T. H. Bolton called attention to the scandalous practice of official receivers lumping a number of bad and doubtful debts together and selling them to the highest bidder. The debts were generally bought up for nominal sums by debt collectors and county court agents, who used their power over the unfortunate debtors with the greatest harshness. In one case £800 worth of debts were sold for 40s., and the purchaser managed to screw £400 out of the debtors besides costs. He also wished to ask why the official receiver at Tunbridge Wells was allowed to have his office in London. Mr. Hanbury called attention to the report of the Inspector-General of Joint-Stock Companies, in which it was shewn that in one year 120 companies were wound up by the order of the court, 23 were voluntarily wound up, and 722 were wound up without any superintendence at all. The winding up of these companies involved a loss of £24,000,000. Of these companies 111 had been in existence for three years, 50 for two years, and 24 for one year only. He thought that something should be done to secure a more efficient supervision of these companies. Mr. Mundella, in reply to Mr. Bolton, said that strict injunctions had been given to official receivers to put an end to the practice of selling debts to debt collectors and others of a similar class. The county court judges were doing their best to put down the traffic, and in one instance a county court judge had made an order for the payment of a debt at the rate of one penny a month. It was found more convenient that the official receiver of Tunbridge Wells should have his office at London-bridge close to the railway station. He agreed with Mr. Hanbury that the report of the Inspector-General of Companies shewed a most scandalous state of affairs, but hoped that the evil could be remedied by the very stringent Act of last year. Sir A. Rollit regretted that the report on the question of bankruptcy administration was not before the House, and expressed the view of legal and commercial circles deprecating the growth of officialism and centralization in reference to bankruptcy administration.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

Herschell.—Aug. 28, at 23, Shakespear-road, Herne-hill, the wife of George S. Herschell, solicitor, of a daughter.

Leck.—Aug. 31, at 58, Union-grove, Clapham, S.W., the wife of D. C. Leck, barrister-at-law, of a son.

Martin.—Sept 2, at St. Fillans, Maybury-hill, Surrey, the wife of Thomas A. Martin, Esq., barrister-at-law, of a daughter.

Meakin.—Sept. 4, at The Grange, Spondon, nr Derby, the wife of James Robinson Meakin, solicitor, of a daughter

Russell.—Sept. 1, at Chingleput, Madras, India, the wife of Samuel Russell, Judge H.M.I.S., of a son.

MARRIAGES.

Chitty—Croft.—Aug. 31, at Dodington Church, Kent, Arthur John, eldest son of the Hon. Mr. Justice Chitty, to Gertrude Mary, second daughter of Sir John Croft, of Dodington Place, Bart.

Ferguson—Peyton.—Sept. 12, at St. George's Church, Hanover-square, William Bates Ferguson, M.A., of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law, to Eveline Alice, only child of the late James Peyton, of Malet Lodge, Putney, S.W.

Smith—Armitage.—Aug. 31, at the parish church, Huddersfield, Joseph Smith, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, to Clara Helen, youngest daughter of Edward Armitage of Edgerton-hill, Huddersfield, J.P.

Wallace—Walker.—Sept. 12, at the Pro-Cathedral, Kensington, George W. Wallace, barrister-at-law, to Alice Bellingham Walker.

DEATHS.

Millman.—Sept 10, William Millman, of 4, Great James-street, Bedford-row, and Beech Brook, Chislehurst, solicitor.

Wickham.—Sept. 10, at Strood, Kent, Humphrey Wickham, solicitor, aged 87.

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—Friday, Sept. 8.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Limited in Chancery.

Amphlett Humphreys, Limited—Petn for winding up, presented Sept 5, directed to be heard on Sept 13. Leesmith & Munby, 27, Copthall avenue, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Sept 12

"Knight of St. Patrick" Tug Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 30, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to John Prendiville and George Ramsden, 3, New Quay, Liverpool. Miller & Williamson, Liverpool, solors for liquidators

Light Asphaltic Cement Syndicate, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 30, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to George Edward Morewood, 158, Leadenhall st

Mummery & Sons, Limited—Petn for continuance of voluntary winding up, presented Sept 4, directed to be heard on Sept 20. Hogan & Hughes, 23, Martin's lane, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Sept 19

Napier & Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Oct 13, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Edward Bailey, 1, Finsbury circus. Cobbett & Co, Manchester, solors for liquidator

National Insurance and Guarantee Corporation, Limited—Petn for winding up, presented Sept 4, directed to be heard on Wednesday, Oct 26. Waltons & Co, 101, Leadenhall st, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of Oct 24

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

Caerdigion St. Cadol Friendly Society, Board School, Rhiwlas, Carnarvon. Sept 2

Oldland Common Friendly Society, Crown and Horse Shoe Inn, Oldland Common, Glos. Sept 5

Perseverance Lodge 340, Merthyr Unity Philanthropic Institution, Ship Tavern, Regent st East, Briton Ferry, Glamorgan. Sept 2

Redmarley Friendly Society, Redmarley, Worcs. Sept 2

London Gazette.—Tuesday, Sept. 12.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

Limited in Chancery.

Imperial Swiss Condensed Milk Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Sept 30, to send in particulars of their claims to Elles Hill, 69 and 70, Mark lane

Salford Brewery Co, Limited—Creditors are required, on or before Nov 15, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to William Bolton, 12, Spring gardens, Manchester. Sutton & Co, solors for liquidators

CREDITORS' NOTICES.

UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 5.

FELTHAM, GEORGE, Portsea, Hants, Solicitor Sept 30 Hart v Ward, Kekewich, J Michell, Buckland, Portsea

London Gazette—TUESDAY, Sept. 12.

CARVER, WILLIAM, Manchester, General Carrier Oct 14 Barlow v Carver, Registrar, Manchester Collier & Carver, Manchester

HOWARD, CHARLES, jun, Thanet st, Burton crescent, Dealer in Horses Oct 1 Howard, sen v Fletcher, Chitty, J Johnson & Dowding, Moorgate st

UNDER 22 & 23 VICT. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Aug. 29.

BLISSET, HENRY, Letton, co Hereford, Clerk in Holy Orders Sept 15 Upton & Co, Austin Friars

BULLOCK, JANE, Coton Hill Asylum, Staffs November 1 Colborne & Co, Newport, Mon

DIXON, JAMES, Wheatley, Ovenden, Halifax, Innkeeper Sept 25 Barstow & Midgley, Halifax

DAVIES, JOSHUA, Penybank, Llangyby, co Cardigan, retired Farmer Oct 2 Hanies, Newport, Mon

DOUGLAS, EMMA JANE, Beechgrove, Kington, Hereford Oct 1 Temple & Philpin, Kington

DYER, GRIFFITHS, Larkhall, Bath, Yeoman Oct 31 Vezey, Bath

HARDCASTLE, JAMES, Scarborough, Gent Sept 30 Drawbridge, Scarborough

JOHN, SAMUEL, Bedwellty, Mon, Clerk in Holy Orders Dec 1 Llewellin, Newport, Mon

JOHNSON, AUGUSTUS SPENCER, Boughton Aluph, Gent Sept 23 Elliott, Verulam bldgs, Gray's inn

LAW, HANNAH, Sach rd, Upper Clapton Oct 12 Bristow, Greenwich

MEARS, HARRIET WELLES, Norfolk sq Oct 10 Gwilt & Gwilt, Duke st, Adelphi

MUSGRAVE, CHARLOTTE MATILDA, Bath Oct 31 Brown & Woolnough, Lincoln's inn fields

POULTON, JAMES, Hertford, Grocer Oct 12 Spence & Co, Hertford

REES, WILLIAM, Caerwiga Isha, Pendovian, Glam, Farmer Oct 7 Bradley, Cardiff

RICHARDS, CHARLOTTE MARY, Bath Oct 21 Rooke & Coker, Bath

RICHARDSON, TIMOTHY, Ockbrook, co Derby, Gent Oct 24 J & W H Sale, Derby

ROBERTS, SARAH, Ruthin, co Denbigh Sept 1 Jones & Co, Queen Victoria st

ROWLAND, JAMES, Little Meolse, nr Hoylake, co Chester, Gent Sept 12 Newman & Kent, Liverpool

SMITH, MARY ANN, Worthing Oct 10 Holmes, Worthing

SNEDLEY, SARAH WILLS, Parkventon, Sithney, Cornwall Sept 16 Walker-Tyacke, Helston

TATNELL, HENRY ARNOLD, Clerkenwell rd, Silversmith Sept 30 Lucas & Ward, Copthall avenue

WALTERS, GEORGE, Edgbaston, Commercial Traveller Sept 30 Bristow, John st, Adelphi

WHITTINGTON, JOHN, Fulbeck, Lincs, Gent Sept 23 Jessop & Co Sleaford

WICKHAM, JOSEPH, Temple Sowerby, Westmrld, Doctor of Medicine Oct 3 Bleasmire & Shepherd, Penrith

WILDSMITH, WILLIAM, Cheetham, Manchester, Builder Sept 16 Hislop, Manchester

YOUNG, JOHN, Upper st, Islington, Grocer Oct 9 Price & Sons, Walbrook

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept 1.

ADDISON, WILLIAM FOUNTAINE, Ossett Vicarage, nr Wakefield, Clerk in Holy Orders Oct 1 Clayhills, Darlington

BICKFORD, MUSGRAVE HELE WEBBER, Exeter, Jobmaster Oct 9 R T & H Campion, Exeter

BOYCE, JOHN, sen, Whittlesey, Isle of Ely, Gent Sept 30 Pead, Whittlesey, nr Peterborough

BRAMHALL, ELIZA, Moncrieffe rd, Sheffield Oct 15 Smith & Sons, Sheffield

BROWN, CHARLES, Warwick, Cabinet Maker Nov 2 Handley & Co, Warwick

BULLOCK, WILLIAM, Finglesham, Northbourne, Kent, Gent Sept 23 Emmerson & Co, Sandwich

BUTTON, WILLIAM, Saltfleet, Lincs, Miller Nov 1 Allisons & Allisons, Louth

CHEETHAM, HARRIET, Withington, nr Manchester Oct 11 Farrar & Co, Manchester

CLAY, MARY ANN, New Leeds, Leeds Oct 1 England, Halifax

DAVIS, HARRIET, Monaco Oct 1 Abrahams & Co, Old Jewry

DAVIS, JANE, Arundel gardens, Kensington park Oct 3 Budd & Co, Austinfriars

DOBSON, EMILY, Kirby in Cleveland, Yorks Oct 14 North & Sons, Leeds

EVANS, EDWARD BICKERTON, Whitbourne Hall, nr Worcester, Esq Oct 10 Worthington & Co, Eastcheap

EVANS, SUSANNAH, Ryde, I W Oct 7 Fardell, Ryde

FONTANEAU, LOUISA, Robinson rd, South Hackney Oct 10 Morten & Co, Newgate st

FOWLER, JAMES, Louth, Architect Nov 1 Allisons & Allisons, Louth

GOLDTHORN, EDWARD, Kensington pk gardens Oct 1 Taylor & Co, Bradford

HALLAS, MARY ANN, Ludhill, nr Huddersfield Oct 1 Laycock & Co, Huddersfield

HEAD, GEORGE, Aston, Somerville, Glos, Clerk in Holy Orders Oct 4 Byrch & Cox, Evesham

HELLER, ROBERT, Plymouth, Superannuated Joiner Dec 30 Rooker & Co, Plymouth

HILLS, OSBORNE JOSEPH, Royal Leamington Spa, Veterinary Surgeon Oct 14 Woodcock & Co, Coventry

HUGHES, JOHN JAMES, Colville mews, Bayswater, Cab Proprietor Sept 30 Fanny Forth, 23, Oakley crescent, Chelsea

JERWOOD, JOHN, Jewin st, Cripplegate, Fancy Goods Importer Sept 30 Double, Jewin crescent, Cripplegate

JONES, JOHN, Llandrillo yn Rhos, nr Colwyn Bay, Hotel Keeper Sept 12 Stubbs, Colwyn Bay

KING, CATHERINE, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler Oct 4 Quilliam, Liverpool

KNAPP, EMMA AUGUSTA MARTHA, Cirencester place, Marylebone Sept 30 Paget, 35, Lincoln's inn fields

LAFRAIK, JOHN STEWART, Talbot crt, Gracechurch st, Merchant Oct 31 Brooks & Co, Godliman st, Doctor's Commons

LUNN, CAROLINE SOPHIA, Leamington Spa Oct 1 Sanderson, Warwick

MACKAY, WILLIAM, Norton, nr Malton, Yorks, Surgeon Oct 23 Estill, Malton

NEWTON, HORACE PARKER, Lower Sloane st, retired General Sept 20 Fladgates, Craig's court, Charing Cross

PRETTEJOHN, CHARLES, Exmouth, Devon Sept 30 Hunters & Haynes, New sq, Lincoln's Inn

RAMSAY, RICHARD HARRIS, Laurence Pountney hill, Contractor Nov 1 Matthews, Lincoln's inn fields

RERSON, DINA, Bolton, Draper Sept 30 Nield, Liverpool

ROUPELL, JOHN STUART, Richmond, Surrey, Esq Oct 1 Robins & Co, Lincoln's inn fields

RUSSELL, RICHARD, Leicester, Gent Sept 30 Stevenson & Son, Leicester

RYALLS, JOHN, Sheffield, Horn Turner Nov 1 Clegg & Sons, Sheffield

SCARF, BENJAMIN, Birmingham, Stuff Merchant Sept 30 Hammond, Bradford

SCOTT, GEORGE, Queen's rd, Peckham, formerly member of firm of Charles Kinloch & Co Sept 30 Kerly & Co, Gt Winchester st

STILLGOE, HENRY CHARLES, Cluddeley, nr Wellington, Gent Oct 13 Carrane, Wellington, Salop

STROHM, FREDERICK, Church st, Edgware rd, Baker Oct 2 Fox, St Mary's sq, Paddington

TUCK, WALTER BARBER, Euston rd Oct 30 Rawlinson, Bedford row

TYRRELL, GEORGE NUGENT, Slough, Bucks, Esq Oct 10 Shakespear, John st, Bedford row

WILKINSON, WILLIAM HENRY, Withington, Lancs, Cigar Merchant Oct 8 Preston & Son, Manchester

WILLIAMS, HARRIET MARY, Bath Oct 4 Stone & Co, Bath

WILSON, THOMAS WHITING, Holloway rd, Chemist Sept 5 Steele, Telegraph st

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, Sept. 5.

AUSTIN, JOSEPH, Bishop's rd, Highgate, Solicitor Nov 1 Hughes & Sons, Chapel st, Bedford row

BAKER, WILLIAM, Halesworth, Suffolk, retired Confectioner Oct 16 Cross & Ram, Halesworth

BALDWIN, BENJAMIN, Loughborough, Jeweller Sept 11 Baldwin, Bristol

BARLOW, ELIZABETH, Buckhurst hill, Essex Nov 1 Hunter & Downes, Coleman st

DOWNES, WILLIAM, Newport, Salop, retired Gamekeeper Sept 14 Carrane, Wellington

DUNBAR, EDWARD, Manchester, Mill Furnisher Oct 13 Marriott & Co, Manchester

EDWARDS, ALFRED NEWSHAM, Brunswick gardens, Campden hill, Kensington, Esq Oct 4 Howe & Rake, Chancery lane

FERNIE, ALEXANDER, West Hartlepool, Ship Store Chandler Sept 14 Brunton & Bunting, West Hartlepool

HAY, FRANCES MARIE, Cheyne court, Chelsea Oct 5 Wingfield, Wool Exchange, Basinghall st

HEDLEY, THOMAS FENWICK, jun, Dinsdale Park, nr Darlington Oct 1 Botterell & Roche, Sunderland

HELPS, ALBERT, Esq, Cornhill Sept 30 Tatham & Proctor, Lincoln's inn fields

KEMBLE, HENRY, Overtown, Swindon, Esq Oct 18 Vertue, New Burlington st

LEWIS, THOMAS, Pantyffynon, Llanegwad, co Carmarthen, retired Tollgate Keeper Oct 1 Bishop, Llandilo

MALTON, EDWARD HENRY, Cavendish villas, Southgate rd, Wood Green, Surgeon Oct 17 Shearman, Gresham st

MILLER, ROBERT, Adlington, Lancs, retired Engineer Sept 19 Miller, Chorley

MOON, EDWARD, Mincing lane, Merchant Oct 1 Hollams & Co, Mincing lane

MORRILL, ANN, Clifton, York Oct 20 Turner, York

MOSLEY, TOM, Sandal Magna, nr Wakefield, Commission Agent Oct 28 Stewart & Co, Wakefield

PINNINGTON, ROWLAND, Manchester, Innkeeper Oct 7 Spafford, Manchester

POULTON, JAMES, Hertford, Grocer Oct 12 Spence & Co, Hertford

RAMSBOTHAM, WALTER BASNETT, Amwell st, Myddelton sq, M.D., Brigade Surgeon (retired) Nov 1 Hunter & Downes, Coleman st

REX, GEORGE, Newcastle upon Tyne Oct 13 Kidd, North Shields

SCANTLEBURY, WILLIAM OLIVER, Aldrington, West Brighton, Gent Oct 5 Stileman & Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury sq

SIMCOCK, ISRAEL, Broadclough, Bacup, Lancs, Farmer Sept 16 Wright, Bacup

SMART, JOHN, Ladywood, Birmingham, Provision Dealer Sept 15 Brown & Co, Birmingham

SMITH, MARGARET COLLINGWOOD, Aycliffe, co Durham Oct 2 Fenwicke, Newcastle upon Tyne

VARNHAM, WILLIAM, Blindley Heath, Horne, Surrey, Farmer Nov 1 Head & Son, East Grinstead

WILLIAMS, ROSAMOND HANBURY, Dorking, Surrey Oct 14 Sladen & Wing, Delahay st, Westminster

WYATT, JOHN WILLIAM, New Mills, co Derby, Licensed Victualler Sept 30 Waller, New Mills

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, Sept 8.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ANNAKIN, CHRISTOPHER, Pannal, nr Harrogate, Butcher York Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

BATEMAN, EDWIN, Knightrider st, Carman High Court Pet Aug 17 Ord Sept 4

BATES, THOMAS, Masborough, nr Rotherham, Boot Dealer Sheffield Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

CHAMBERS, JOHN THOMAS JOS, Handsworth, Staffs, Rope Manufacturer Birmingham Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

DUNBAR, JOHN, Wigan, Stationer Wigan Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

GILHESPY, THOMAS, Cornsay, co Durham, Tailor Durham Pet Aug 26 Ord Sept 5

ILLMAN, HENRY BASTARD, Monmouth, Seedsman Newport, Mon Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

JARMAN, JOHN, Hove, Sussex, Wheelwright Brighton Pet Aug 22 Ord Sept 5

JUDE, JOHN, Bury St Edmunds, Baker Bury St Edmunds Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

KERSWELL, FREDERICK SAMUEL, Hastings, Clerk Hastings Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

KING, JOSEPH ARTHUR, Bath, Confectioner Bath Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

KLEPFER, JOHN BAPTIST, Bradford, Tobacconist Bradford Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

LLOYD, JOHN THOMAS, and WILLIAM ARTHUR WILLIAMS, Cardiff, Grocers Cardiff Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

LOOSEMORE, JOHN, Chepstow, Mon, Tobacconist Newport, Mon Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

LUCAS, JAMES, Eastleigh, co Southampton, Coach Builder Southampton Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

MAIN, CHARLES PARSONS, Irthlingborough Grange, Northamptonshire, Farmer Northampton Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 6

MEDLAND, JOHN BRANDON, Borough, London bridge, Optician High Court Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

MEREWETHER, WALTER, Hereford, Gent Hereford Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

MORGAN, CECIL HERBERT, SAMUEL EVELAND ISTED, and EDWARD PERCY MORGAN, Southampton, Contractors Southampton Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

ORCHARD, ALFRED, Exeter, Optician Exeter Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

OWEN, JOHN, Runcorn, Draper Warrington Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

POWELL, THOMAS JAMES, Llanelly, Ironmonger Carmarthen Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 6

RETHKIN, JOHN, Swansea, Sack Dealer Swansea Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4

RICHES, CHARLES, Cavendish, Suffolk, Headmaster of Grammar School Colchester Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

ROBINSON, CHARLES, Bath, Journeyman Sausage Skin Manufacturer Bath Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

BOWBOTTOM, SELINA PHILLIPINE ANNIE, Derby, Electrical Engineer Derby Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
SPRINGER, JOHN, Shelton, Staffs, Organ Builder Hanley, Burslem and Tunstall Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
TILDSLEY, JOSEPH, Warrington, Brickmaker Warrington Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
TRISTRAM, JOHN, Hereford, Builder Hereford Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
VINCE, CHARLES, and EDWIN CHARLES DAVIES, Wood st, Wholesale Trimming Warehousemen High Court Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
WATKINS, ALFRED, Blaengarw, Glam, Grocer Cardiff Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
WEDLAKE, ANTHONY MANNING, Norton, Worcs, Farmer Worcester Pet Aug 23 Ord Sept 5
WOODY, ROBERT, Castle Cary, Somerset, Hotel Proprietor Yeovil Pet Aug 22 Ord Sept 4
WOOLSTON, FREDERIC, Balaclava rd, Bermondsey, Coal Merchant High Court Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

FIRST MEETINGS.

ANNAKIN, CHRISTOPHER, Pannal, nr Harrogate, Butcher Sept 18 at 12.30 Off Rec, York
BARCLAY, WILLIAM, Newcastle on Tyne, Merchant Sept 15 at 11 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne
BATEMAN, ARTHUR HENRY, Greenwich, Emery Wheel Manufacturer Sept 15 at 11.30 24, Railway approach, London Bridge
BATEMAN, EDWIN, Knightrider st, Carman Sept 15 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
BLACKBURN, SAMUEL, Hyde, Cheshire, Painter Sept 15 at 3 Ogden's chmbrs, Bridge st, Manchester
BOLTON, CURTIS, Heigham, Norwich, Grocer Sept 16 at 11 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
BOOTH, JANE, and EDWIN BOOTH, Pancras rd, King's Cross, Coal Merchants Sept 18 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
DAVIES, MORGAN, late of Newport, Mon, late Woollen Merchant Sept 15 at 3 Off Rec, Ogden's chmbrs, Bridge st, Manchester
DICKINSON, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Mount View rd, Stroud Green, Travelling Agent Sept 18 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
DUNBAR, JOHN, Wigan, Stationer Sept 18 at 11 16, Wood st, Bolton
EDWARDS, EDWARD JOHN, and JAMES WILLIAM MAGNA, Gutter lane, Trimming Manufacturers Sept 15 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
EMONS, ALFRED, Old Kent rd, Draper Sept 18 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
GLOVER, PETER, jun, Ridgehill, Stalybridge, Farmer Oct 5 at 12.45 Townhall, Ashton under Lyne
GASCOYNE, FREDERICK, THOMAS BENNETT, SAMUEL WOOD, SAMUEL STEPHENSON, and GEORGE HOGGARD, Dronfield, Derbyshire, Coal Miners Sept 15 at 4 Angel Hotel, Chesterfield
GRIFFITHS, THOMAS, and BENJAMIN GRIFFITHS, Blaentreole, Llangeler, Carmarthenshire, Farmers Sept 16 at 11 Off Rec, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen
GOODSMITH, GEORGE, Brockenhurst, co Southampton, late Schoolmaster Sept 18 at 12 Off Rec, 4, East st, Southampton
HODGKINSON, FRANK, Hendon, no occupation Sept 21 at 3 Off Rec, 95, Temple chmbrs, Temple avenue
JONES, JOSHUA EVANS, Barry Dock, Glam, Chemist Sept 21 at 11 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff
JOSEPH, JACOB, Whitechapel rd Sept 15 at 1 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
KNOWLES, THOMAS, Earlestown, Lancs, Tailor Sept 15 at 3.30 Ogden's chmbrs, Bridge st, Manchester
LEWIS, SAM, Leeds, Boot Maker Sept 15 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
LITTLE, JOHN DOBIE, Barrow in Furness, Bank Manager Sept 15 at 11 Off Rec, 16, Cornwallis st, Barrow in Furness
LUCAS, JAMES, Eastleigh, co Southampton, Coach Builder Sept 21 at 3, Off Rec, 4, East st, Southampton
LYON, A, formerly Sun st, Finsbury, Importer of Oriental Manufactures Sept 15 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey street
MEARS, J E, St Anne's, Lewes, Race Horse Owner Sept 15 at 12.30 Off Rec, 24, Railway approach, London Bridge
MEDLAND, JOHN BRANDON, Borough, London Bridge, Optician Sept 18 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey street
MORSE, THOMAS, Gt Yarmouth, Butcher Sept 19 at 10.30 Lovewell Blake, South Quay, Gt Yarmouth
MORGAN, CECIL HERBERT, SAMUEL EVELAND ISTED, and EDWARD PERCY MORGAN, Portswood, Southampton, Contractors Sept 18 at 3 Off Rec, 4, East st, Southampton
ORCHARD, ALFRED, Exeter, Optician Sept 18 at 11 Off Rec, Exeter
OWEN, JOHN, Runcorn, Draper Oct 6 at 11.15 Court House, Upper Bank st, Warrington
PHILLIPS, SAMUEL WILLIAM, Neath Abbey, Glam, Licensed Victualler Sept 15 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea
PLEYDELL, EDWARD HENRY ROBERT, East Moors, Cardiff, Butcher Sept 18 at 11.30 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff
POCOCK, THOMAS, Reading, Butcher Sept 15 at 12 Queen's Hotel, Reading
ROBERTS, JOHN, Cefnmawr, Denbighshire, Grocer Sept 15 at 3 Crypt chmbrs, Chester
SEEDLEY, WILLIAM JOHN, Meden Bank, nr Skegby, Colliery Deputy Sept 15 at 12 Off Rec, St Peter's Church walk, Nottingham
SMITH, RICHARD ARTHUR, Stoke upon Trent, Brick Manufacturer Sept 19 at 12 North Stafford Hotel, Stoke upon Trent
ST JOHN, ANNIE BARBARA, Cheltenham, Boarding House Keeper Sept 16 at 4 County Court bldgs, Cheltenham
THOMAS, WILLIAM BOWEN, Tirphil, Glam, Monumental Sculptor Sept 15 at 12 Off Rec, 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil
WISE, EDWARD TAYLOR, Lowestoft, Sanitary Plumber Sept 16 at 11.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
WILLIAMS, WILLIAM MCDANIEL, Fontardulais, Glam, Licensed Victualler Sept 15 at 2 Off Rec, Alexandria rd, Swansea

ADJUDICATIONS.

ANNAKIN, CHRISTOPHER, Pannal, nr Harrogate, Butcher York Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
BATES, THOMAS, Masborough, nr Rotherham, Boot Dealer Sheffield Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
BELL, HAROLD FRASER, Malden rd, Kentish Town, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet July 25 Ord Sept 6
BELLAMY, CATHERINE, Heathfield rd, Bexley Heath, Widow High Court Pet July 27 Ord Sept 6
BLIGHT, ROBERT, Cardiff, Butcher Cardiff Pet Sept 1 Ord Sept 5
BOOTH, JANE, and EDWIN BOOTH, Pancras rd, King's Cross, Coal Merchants High Court Pet Sept 1 Ord Sept 5
CHAPMAN, THOMAS, Liverpool, Hosier Liverpool Pet July 14 Ord Sept 6
CHAPPELL, ARTHUR J, Oxford st, Managing Director of D'Oyly & Co High Court Pet Aug 1 Ord Sept 2
CLARKSON, JAMES, York, Labourer York Pet Sept 2 Ord Sept 2
CORNEY, JOHN, Brighton, Public Accountant Brighton Pet Aug 11 Ord Sept 5
COWAN, ALEXANDER, Modora rd, Brixton, Hot Water Engineer High Court Pet Aug 3 Ord Sept 6
DUNCAN, ALEXANDER, Bournemouth, Chemist Poole Pet June 28 Ord Sept 6
GLOVER, PETER, jun, Ridgehill, Stalybridge, Farmer Stalybridge Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 2
HOLT, JOHN LAWRENCE, Highbridge, Somerset, Plumber Bridgwater Pet Aug 8 Ord Sept 6
ILLMANN, HENRY BASTARD, Monmouth, Seedsman Newport, Mon Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
INCE, GEORGE, Stubshaw Cross, Ashton in Makerfield, Lancs, Provision Dealer Wigan Pet Aug 10 Ord Sept 6
JOHNSON, CHARLES, Churchdown, Brewers' Architect Gloucester Pet Aug 11 Ord Sept 6
JONES, FREDERICK, Brighton, Pork Butcher Brighton Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 5
JUDE, JOHN, Bury, St Edmunds, Baker Bury St Edmunds Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
KERSWELL, FREDERICK SAMUEL, Hastings, Clerk Hastings Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
KING, JOSEPH ARTHUR, Bath, Confectioner Bath Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4
LLOYD, JOHN THOMAS, and WILLIAM ARTHUR WILLIAMS, Cardiff, Grocers Cardiff Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4
LUCAS, JAMES, Eastleigh, co Southampton, Coach Builder Southampton Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
MERRYWETHER, WALTER, Hereford, Gent Hereford Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4
MERRELL, JOSEPH, Tunbridge Wells, Newspaper Proprietor Tunbridge Wells Pet Aug 4 Ord Sept 4
ORCHARD, ALFRED, Exeter, Optician Exeter Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4
OWEN, JOHN, Runcorn, Draper Warrington Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4
OWENS, JOHN WAUGH, Hove, Sussex, Professor of Music Brighton Pet Aug 31 Ord Sept 5
PORTER, WILLIAM, Deptford, Kent, Firewood Merchant Greenwich Pet Aug 3 Ord Sept 4
PRUSTE, LOUIS GEORGE, Eastbourne, Fine Art Dealer Eastbourne Pet Aug 10 Ord Sept 4
RETEKIN, JOHN, Swansea, Sack Dealer Swansea Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4
RICHES, CHARLES, Cavendish, Suffolk, Head Master of Grammar School Colchester Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
ROBINSON, CHARLES, Bath, Journeyman Sausage Skin Manufacturer Bath Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
ROGERSON, WILLIAM, Northwich, Grocer Nantwich and Crewe Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 5
ROWBOTTOM, SELINA PHILLIPINE ANNIE, Derby, Electrical Engineer Derby Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
SCHWABEL, H, Sydenham, Kent, Jeweller Greenwich Pet Aug 14 Ord Sept 4
STONEMAN, ALBERT FREDERICK, Noel Park terrace, Wood Green, Draper Edmonton Pet July 20 Ord Sept 4
THOMAS, JOHN, Pontypridd, Glam, Auctioneer Pontypridd Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 4
TRISTRAM, JOHN, Hereford, Builder Hereford Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
VENABLES, FREDERICK, Barnet, Herts, Auctioneer Barnet Pet June 23 Ord Sept 2
WATKINS, ALFRED, Blaengarw, Glam, Grocer Cardiff Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
WEAVER, CHARLES, Consett, co Durham, House Furniture Maker Newcastle on Tyne Pet Aug 1 Ord Sept 5
WEDLAKE, ANTHONY MANNING, Norton, Worcs, Farmer Worcester Pet Aug 23 Ord Sept 5

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

MEE, WILLIAM, Sheffield, Innkeeper Sheffield Adjud April 15, 1878 Annul Aug 24

London Gazette—TUESDAY, Sept 12.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

AIREY, RICHARD, Bradford, Umbrella Maker Bradford Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
BARNES, TOM, Boscombe, Bournemouth, Plumber Poole Pet Aug 28 Ord Sept 6
BIRBE, JOHN, Tipton, Staffs, Tailor Dudley Pet Aug 10 Ord Sept 6
BOURDELAIN, JOHN, Beech House, Feltham, Advertising Agent Kingston, Surrey Pet April 21 Ord Aug 31
BRIGHTWELL, WILLIAM, Petersfield, Hants, Solicitor's Clerk Portsmouth Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
CLARKE, ALLAN WISE, Usk, Mon, Physician Newport, Mon Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
CLUTTERBUCK, JOHN ALBERT, Heaton, Newcastle on Tyne, Clerk Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
CUDBERTSON, ANNIE JEMIMA, Kingston upon Hull, Stationer Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
DURRIDGE, GEORGE, Guildford, Surrey, Solicitor Guildford Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
EVANS, ALFRED, Broad st, Ross, Herefordshire, Clothier Hereford Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
EVERETT, LEWIS, Sowerby, Yorks, Grocer Chester Pet Aug 28 Ord Sept 7
FAVELL, ALFRED THOMAS, Hereford rd, Bayswater, Builder High Court Pet Aug 16 Ord Sept 8
GIBLING, GEORGE, Hardinge st, Commercial rd, Stepney, Journeyman Coach Maker High Court Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
GOLIAH, JOHN, Sundorne Grove, nr Shrewsbury, Farmer Shrewsbury Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
GREATBACK, WILLIAM CHARLES, Burslem, Staffs, Butcher Burslem Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
GREEN, ERNEST, Adelaide rd, Haverstock Hill, Gent Cambridge Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 9
HALL, GEORGE ALBERT, Kettering, Grocer Northampton Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
HAMMOND, EDWARD SAMUEL, Uphill, Somerset, Draper Bridgwater Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 8
HILYER, GEORGE, Cheltenham, Decorator Cheltenham Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
HOWARTH, ROBERT, Droyleden, Lancs, Watchmaker Ashton under Lyne and Stalybridge Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
HUDSON, WILLIAM J, and PERCY JACKSON, Gracechurch st, Ship Brokers High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 8
JACKSON, PERCY, Gracechurch st High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 8
JOHNSON, H P, & Co, Longton, Staffs, Commission Agents Longton Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 6
JOYCE, WALTER, Villiers st, Strand, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Aug 11 Ord Sept 8
LARDER, CHARLES, Gt Driffield, Yorks, Innkeeper Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
LETCHER, JAMESON, St Issey, Cornwall, Coal Merchant Truro Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
MIDDLETON, THOMAS HENRY, Brighouse, Yorks, Draper Halifax Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
MOORE, ALFRED JOHN, Measham, Derbyshire, Coach Builder Burton on Trent Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6
MORRIS, THOMAS, Bristol, Draper Bristol Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
NASH, FREDERICK, Dry Drayton, Cambs, Farmer Cambridge Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
NIELSON, JOSEPH, Gloucester ter, South Kensington, Furniture Dealer High Court Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
PEARCE, JOHN RICHARD, Gt Grimsby, Fish Merchant Gt Grimsby Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 7
PRATT, JAMES, London rd, Hazel grove, nr Stockport, Painter Stockport Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
PREWETT, THOMAS, Fishponds, Stapleton, Glos, Carpenter Bristol Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
RICHARDS, WILLIAM RAYMENT, Moorgate st, Tailor High Court Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
SMITH, CHARLES HENRY, and FREDERICK AUGUSTUS SMITH, Netherton, Worcs, Builders Dudley Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5
SNARR, FREDERICK, York, Fruit Merchant York Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
SPENCER, WILLIAM JAMES, Gray's inn rd, Optician High Court Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
THORN, GEORGE, Chesham, Bucks, Bootmaker Aylesbury Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
TILSTON, THOMAS, Sunderland, Clerk in Holy Orders Sunderland Pet June 24 Ord Sept 8
WALKER, JOHN, Longcliffe, Shepshed, Leics, Farmer Leicester Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
WHARTON, GEORGE, York, Glass Dealer York Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8
WHITEHEAD, ROBERT, Idle, nr Bradford, Bazaar Proprietor Bradford Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
WILKINSON, THOMAS, Bradford, Grocer Bradford Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
WILSON, FREDERICK AXEL, Gloucester, Plumber Gloucester Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9
WISHART, GEORGE DUNNET, Liverpool, Tobacco Broker Liverpool Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7
WINDSOR, H B, The Stock Exchange High Court Pet Aug 18 Ord Sept 7
WOODS, GEORGE ABRAM, Great Grimsby, Fisherman Great Grimsby Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 7

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Aug 11 :—

WALWYN, JAMES, Tunstall, Staffs, Bootmaker Tunstall Pet Aug 5 Ord Aug 5

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Aug 25 :—

HURLY, MICHAEL DONALD, Friday st High Court Pet July 5 Ord Aug 22

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Sept 5 :—

MURRELL, JOHN THOMAS, Birmingham, Painter Birmingham Pet Sept 1 Ord Sept 1

FIRST MEETINGS.

ABELS, FRANK, Bordesley, Birmingham, Tailor Sept 22 at 10.30 23, Colmore row, Birmingham
AIREY, RICHARD, Bradford, Umbrella Maker Sept 21 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
AYLING, WILLIAM, Esher, Surrey, Grocer Sept 19 at 11.30 24, Railway app, London bridge
BERLEY, JOHN HENRY, Sheffield, Insurance Agent Sept 20 at 11 Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield
BLAND, JOSEPH, Eastbourne, Hairdresser Sept 20 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough
BRESLAUER, ADOLPH, Leadenhall bldgs, Leadenhall st, Merchant Sept 20 at 11 Bankruptcy buildings, Carey street
BROWN, LEEDS CHRISTOPHER, Salisbury st, Bermondsey, Wheelwright Sept 21 at 12 Bankruptcy buildings, Carey st
CALDER, JAMES, Queen Victoria st Sept 21 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
COLLINSON, JOHN, Whitby, Hotel Keeper Sept 20 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough
DAGWORTHY, JOSEPH, Bristol rd, Upton park, Messenger Sept 20 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

EVANS, EDWARD, Bargoed, Gellygaer, Glam, Draper Sept 20 at 12 Off Rec, 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil

EVANS, WILLIAM, Tanymynydd, Llabedrog, Carnarvonshire, Farmer Sept 28 at 11 45 Police Court, Portmadoc

GOLIAH, JOHN, Sundorn Grove, nr Shrewsbury, Farmer Sept 26 at 2.30 Off Rec, Talbot chmbrs, Shrewsbury

GRAVETT, THOMAS, Burnley, Chemist Sept 20 at 3 Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley

GRIFFITHS, OSMOND, Maxfield, Kinlet, Salop, Wood Hoop Maker Sept 19 at 3 Miller Corbet, solicitor, Kidderminster

HARDY, MARTIN, Darlington, Joiner Sept 20 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough

JONES, WILLIAM THOMAS, Nelson, Lancs, Insurance Agent Sept 20 at 2.30 Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Burnley

KING, JOSEPH ARTHUR, Bath, Confectioner Sept 27 at 12 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Corn st, Bristol

KLEPPER, JOHN BAPTIST, Bradford, Tobacconist Sept 21 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford

LOWE, IGNATZ, Newcastle on Tyne, House Furnisher Sept 21 at 11 Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne

MANICO, EDWARD CALLEY, Metal Exchange bldgs, Cutlery Manufacturer Sept 20 at 10.30 Off Rec, Figtree lane, Sheffield

MIDDLETON, THOMAS HENRY, Brighouse, Draper Sept 20 at 11 Off Rec, Townhall chmbrs, Halifax

MOORE, ALFRED JOHN, Measham, Derbyshire, Coachbuilder Sept 19 at 3 Midland Hotel, Station st, Burton on Trent

MURRELL, JOHN THOMAS, Birmingham, Painter Sept 21 at 12 23 Colmore row, Birmingham

NASH, FREDERICK, Dry Drayton, Cambs, Farmer Sept 22 at 12 Off Rec, 5, Petty Cury, Cambridge

PITTS, JOHN EDWARD, Rochdale, Painter Sept 19 at 11 Townhall, Rochester

POWELL, GEORGE, Middlesborough, Newsagent Sept 20 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough

PREWETT, THOMAS, Fishponds, Stapleton, Glos, Carpenter Sept 27 at 12.30 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Corn st, Bristol

ROBERTS, RICHARD, Collier st, Clerkenwell, Milk Carrier Sept 21 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

ROBINSON, CHARLES, Bath, Journeyman Sausage Skin Manufacturer Sept 27 at 12.15 Off Rec, Bank chmbrs, Corn st, Bristol

ROWBOTTOM, SELINA PHILLIPINE ANNIE, Derby, Electrical Engineer Sept 20 at 12 Off Rec, St James's chmbrs, Derby

SETTER, WILLIAM, Ystrad, Rhondda, Glam, Grocer Sept 19 at 3 Off Rec, 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil

SHAKESPEARE, JOHN, West Bromwich, General Smith Sept 29 at 2 County Court, West Bromwich

SMAILES, JAMES, Leeds, Whitesmith Sept 20 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds

SNARR, FREDERICK, York, Fruit Merchant Sept 22 at 12 30 Off Rec, 28 Stonegate, York

TWEED, ISAAC CHANDLER, Moulsham, Chelmsford, Coal Dealer Sept 20 at 12 A J Prior, Eld lane, Wyre st, Colchester

VINCOE, CHARLES, and EDWIN CHARLES DAVIES, Wood st, Wholesale Trimming Warehousemen Sept 20 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

WALKER, JOHN, Longcliffe, Shepshed, Leics, Farmer Sept 19 at 3 Off Rec, 34, Friar lane, Leicester

WATSON, HALL, Stockton on Tees, Blacksmith Sept 20 at 3 Off Rec, 8, Albert rd, Middlesborough

WHITEHEAD, ROBERT, Idle, nr Bradford, Bazaar Proprietor Sept 22 at 11 30 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford

WHARTON, GEORGE, York, Glass Dealer Sept 22 at 11 Off Rec, 28, Stonegate, York

WIGGETT, ROBERT, Castle Cary, Somerset, Hotel Proprietor Sept 19 at 1.15 Off Rec, Salisbury

WILKINSON, THOMAS, Bradford, Grocer Sept 22 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford

WILLIAMS, EDWARD, Treharris, Glam, Grocer Sept 19 at 12 Off Rec, 65, High st, Merthyr Tydfil

WILSON, JOHN, Paul's Wharf, Upper Thames st, Carrier Sept 21 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

WISHART, GEORGE DUNNET, Liverpool, Tobacco Broker Sept 20 at 2 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool

WYATT, FRANCIS WALTER, Sutton, Surrey, Builder Sept 20 at 11.30 24, Railway approach, London Bridge

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of 8th Sept., 1893:—

BATEMAN, ARTHUR HENRY, Greenwich, Emery Wheel Manufacturer Sept 15 at 11.30 24, Railway approach, London Bridge

ADJUDICATIONS.

AIREY, RICHARD, Bradford, Umbrella Maker Bradford Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

BEIRNE, JOHN, Tipton, Staffs, Tailor Dudley Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 9

BRIGHTWELL, WILLIAM, Petersfield, Hants, Solicitors' Clerk Portsmouth Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

CHAMBERS, JOHN THOMAS JOB, Handsworth, Staffs, Rope Manufacturer Birmingham Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 5

CHEDGEY, JAMES, Richmond, Surrey, Wine Retailer Wandsworth Pet Sept 1 Ord Sept 8

CLARKE, ALLAN WISE, Usk, Mon, Physician Newport, Mon Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 9

CLUTTERBUCK, JOHN, ALBERT, Heaton, Newcastle on Tyne, Clerk Newcastle on Tyne Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9

CUDBERTSON, ANNIE JEMIMA, Kingston upon Hull, Stationer Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

CURNOW, HENRY EDWARD, Bridge rd, Hammersmith, Coal Agent High Court Pet Aug 1 Ord Sept 7

DUNBAR, JOHN, Wigan, Stationer Wigan Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 8

EVANS, ALFRED, Ross, Herefordshire, Clothier Hereford Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9

EVES, JAMES HENRY, and STAFFORD BROWN, London wall, Hotel Valuers High Court Pet July 5 Ord Sept 7

GILHESPY, THOMAS, Cornsay, co Durham, Tailor Durham Pet Aug 26 Ord Sept 8

GIRLING, GEORGE, Hardinge st, Commercial rd, Stepney, Journeyman Coachmaker High Court Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

GREATBACH, WILLIAM CHARLES, Burslem, Staffs, Butcher Burslem Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

HALL, GEORGE ALBERT, Kettering, Grocer Northampton Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

HAMMERTON, LEVI LAWFORD, and WILLIAM WHITE, Winchester, Builders Winchester Pet Aug 24 Ord Sept 8

HAMMOND, EDWARD SAMUEL, Uphill, Somerset, Draper Bridgwater Pet Sept 4 Ord Sept 8

HERRIDGE, ARTHUR, Trowbridge, Steeple Ashton, Wilts, Builder Bath Pet Aug 19 Ord Sept 8

HILYER, GEORGE, Cheltenham, Decorator Cheltenham Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

JACKSON, GEORGE, Hafodywern Farm, nr Wrexham, Farmer Wrexham Pet Aug 3 Ord Sept 7

LARDER, CHARLES, Great Driffield, Yorks, Innkeeper Kingston upon Hull Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

LETCHER, JAMESON, St Issey, Cornwall, Coal Merchant Truro Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9

LOOSEMORE, JOHN, Chepstow, Mon, Tobacconist Newport, Mon Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 9

MARTIN, JAMES, late of Hartlepool, Licensed Victualler Sunderland Pet June 26 Ord Sept 8

MIDDLETON, THOMAS HENRY, Brighouse, Draper Halifax Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

MOORE, ALFRED JOHN, Measham, Derbyshire, Coachbuilder Burton on Trent Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 6

MURRELL, JOHN THOMAS, Birmingham, Painter Birmingham Pet Sept 1 Ord Sept 5

NASH, FREDERICK, Dry Drayton, Cambs, Farmer Cambridge Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

NICHOLS, JOSEPH ARTHUR, Andover yd, Hornsey rd, Engineer High Court Pet July 3 Ord Sept 7

NIELSON, JOSEPH, Gloucester terrace, South Kensington, Furniture Dealer High Court Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

PEARCE, JOHN RICHARD, Gt Grimsby, Fish Merchant Gt Grimsby Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 7

PRATT, JAMES, London rd, Hazel grove, nr Stockport, Painter Stockport Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

RAMSDEN, JAMES, and THOMAS MARSDEN, Paddock, Huddersfield, Joiners Pet Aug 16 Ord Sept 6

RICHARDS, WILLIAM RAYMENT, Moorgate st, Tailor High Court Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

SMITH, CHARLES HENRY, and FREDERICK AUGUSTUS SMITH, Netherton, Worcs, Builders Dudley Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 6

SNARR, FREDERICK, York, Fruit Merchant York Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

SPENCER, WILLIAM JAMES, Gray's inn rd, Optician High Court Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

TILDSLEY, JOSEPH, Warrington, Brickmaker Warrington Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 8

WALKER, JOHN, Longcliffe, Shepshed, Leics, Farmer Leicester Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 7

WHARTON, GEORGE, York, Glass Dealer York Pet Sept 8 Ord Sept 8

WHITEHEAD, ROBERT, Idle, nr Bradford, Bazaar Proprietor Bradford Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 7

WIGGETT, ROBERT, Castle Cary, Somerset, Hotel Proprietor Yeovil Pet Aug 19 Ord Sept 8

WILKINSON, THOMAS, Bradford, Grocer Bradford Pet Sept 6 Ord Sept 7

WILLIAMS, WILLIAM MCDANIEL, Pontardulais, Glam, Licensed Victualler Swansea Pet Aug 30 Ord Sept 7

WILSON, FREDERICK AXEL, Gloucester, Plumber Gloucester Pet Sept 9 Ord Sept 9

WILSON, JOHN, Paul's Wharf, Upper Thames st, Carrier High Court Pet Sept 1 Ord Sept 7

WISHART, GEORGE DUNNET, Liverpool, Tobacco Broker Liverpool Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

WOODS, GEORGE ABRAM, Gt Grimsby, Fisherman Great Grimsby Pet Sept 7 Ord Sept 7

WOOLSTON, FREDERIC, Balaclava rd, Bermondsey, Coal Merchant High Court Pet Sept 5 Ord Sept 7

The following amended notice is substituted for that published in the London Gazette of Aug 11:—

WALWYN, JAMES, Tunstall, Staffs, Bootmaker Tunstall Pet Aug 5 Ord Aug 5

All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE, *which includes Indexes, Digests, Statutes, and Postage*, 52*s*. WEEKLY REPORTER, *in wrapper*, 26*s*.; *by Post*, 28*s*. SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 26*s*. 0*d*.; *by Post*, 28*s*. 0*d*. *Volumes bound at the office—cloth*, 2*s*. 9*d*., *half law calf*, 5*s*. 6*d*.

ENGINEER'S DIARY